THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

AUG 14 1959

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

AND

A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.

REV. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

VOLUME THE THIRTY-FOURTH.

October 1922 – September 1923.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T587 47,399

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON .	. SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER	. JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH .	. JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW .	. JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK .	. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXIV.

AUTHORS.

Ven. Archdeacon Willoughby C. Allen, M.A.— PAGE
St. John $7^{37.38}$ 329
K. Baba—
'A Great High Priest' 476
Rev. E. E. Baldwin—
Divergences between the Peshitta and the Sinai Syriac Accounts of Jesus' Reception of the Children . . . 281
Professor J. Vernon Bartlet, D.D.—
The Epistle to the Hebrews once more . 58
Rev. S. J. Bastow—
Readings of the Scottish Bibles . . 280
Rev. Edward Beal—
Can a Divine Revelation be Ambiguous? 278
The Face Value of the Gospels . . 559
Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D.—
The Reticence of God 504
Rev. Buchanan Blake, D.D.—
For Christ's Sake 282
Rev. A. E. Burn, D.D.—
The Unnamed Companion of Cleopas . 428
Rev. J. H. Burn, D.D.—
Philippians 2^{12} 562
Maurice A. Canney, M.A.—
Shaddai 332
Rev. C. Evelyn Charlesworth—
The Unnamed Companion of Cleopas . 233
Professor A. T. Clay, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D.—
The Early Amorite King Humbaba . 38
Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D.—
The Servant of the Lord . . . 440
Rev. Herbert Crossland, M.A.—
The Angel of God 91
Professor W. A. Curtis, D.D., D.Litt.—
James Hastings 102
Professor W. L. Davidson, LL.D.—
George Adam Smith 56
Rev. F. A. Farley—
A Text (Luke 13^{33}) 429
Rev. W. J. Farley, B.D.—
The 'Two Natures' of Our Lord . . 184
Rev. D. R. Fotheringham, M.A.—
'I buffet my Body' 140
Rev. A. T. Fryer, M.A.—
The Sacrifice of Isaac 138
Principal Alfred E. Garvie, D.D.—
The Nature of Redemption . . . 7, 74
God's Purpose as Revealed in Jesus . 520

Thomas C. Gordon, M.A.— PAGE
The Fourth Cry from the Cross . . 380
Rev. Arthur J. Gossip, M.A.—
A Communion Meditation . . . 19
French Theology 127, 264
A Memorial Sermon 171
Virginibus Puerisque 177, 218, 266, 268, 309, 310, 361, 362, 416, 418, 465, 509, 552
Most Rev. John A. F. Gregg, D.D.—
Christ our Redemption 355
Edward Grubb, M.A.—
The Wrath of God in the Teaching of Jesus 214
Bernard G. Hall—
Φορτίον and Βάρη 563
J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D.—
St. Paul and Aristophanes . . . 151
Muhammad and the 'Diatessaron' . 377
Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.—
The Structure of St. Paul's Hymn of Love 488
Rev. Henry Holloway—
2 Kings 4^{26} 526
Rev. James T. Hudson—
Q's Eschatology: A Study of Luke 17^{20-37} 187
Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.—
The Differentia of the Gospel according to St. Luke 306
The Breaking-Point 453
Rev. Arthur Jones, D.Lit.—
Βάρος and Φορτίον 333
E. E. Kellett, M.A.—
Note on Acts 13^{42} 188
Note on Acts 26^{28} 563
Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sc., D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology . 217, 328, 415
Rev. R. Kilgour, D.D.—
Readings of the Scottish Bibles . . 279
Rev. V. T. Kirby, M.A.—
Christ's Resurrection as Evidence to Itself 523
Rev. Daniel Lamont, B.D.—
The Place of Systematic Theology in Preaching 359

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.— PAGE
The Codex Vaticanus on Romans 9^5 . 331

Rev. F. WARBURTON LEWIS, B.A.—
Dr. Garvie's Book on the Fourth Gospel . 378

B. B. LIEBERMAN—
Note on Job 17^{11} 330

Professor W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D.—
The City and the Sanctuary . . . 198

Professor JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology . 294, 326, 551
The Local Colour of the Bible . . 376

C. M. MACKAY, M.A.—
The City and the Sanctuary . . . 475

Professor H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Litt, D.D.—
Wobbermin 27
James Hastings 104
Paulus' Interpretation of 'Christ' . . 262

Rev. E. MACMILLAN—
Note on St. John $16^{23.24}$ 379

Rev. MALCOLM MCQUEEN—
The Theophany at Horeb 331

Professor D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.—
Arabia in the Bible 457

Rev. A. D. MARTIN—
A Sequel to the Wilderness-Temptation . 259

Professor J. HUGH MICHAEL, M.A.—
The First and Second Epistles to the Philippians 106

Rev. H. R. MOXLEY—
'I buffet my Body' 235

Rev. W. D. NIVEN, M.A.—
Recent Foreign Theology . 25, 175, 264

Rev. R. PARKES, M.A.—
The Sacrifice of Isaac 280

Professor ARTHUR S. PEAKE, D.D.—
'In League with the Stones of the Field' 42

Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.—
The Apocryphal Gospels . . . 373, 473

Rev. F. J. RAE, M.A.—
Religious Experience and the New Psychology 459

Rev. STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque . . 465, 510, 553

W. ROBINSON, M.A.—
Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon . . 89

Right Rev. Bishop H. E. RYLE, D.D.—
James Hastings 102

Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D.—
A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform . 76
Epiphany 140
Babylonian Wisdom 561

Professor J. A. SELBIE, D.D.— PAGE
'A Great High Priest' 477

Professor J. M. Shaw, D.D.—
Jesus' Thought of Prayer . . . 506

The late Rev. C. P. SHERMAN—
'A Great High Priest' 235

Rev. W. PARTON SHINTON—
For the Sake of the Sufferer . . . 426

Professor JAMES STALKER, D.D.—
'The Strangest Figure' in the War . 124

Rev. J. SINCLAIR STEVENSON—
2 Timothy 4^{13} and The Question of St. Paul's Second Captivity . . . 524

Rev. J. S. STEWART, B.D.—
Eternal Life and Deification . . . 342

Rev. R. H. STRACHAN, D.D.—
The Development of Thought within the Fourth Gospel 228, 246

Emeritus Principal J. G. TASKER, D.D.—
Theology and Religion 23
Herrmann of Marburg 321
Recent Studies of Schleiermacher . . 414

Rev. J. H. TERRAS—
Scottish Bibles 140

Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.—
Tasting 379

Rev. P. THOMSON, D.D.—
Philippians 2^{12} 429

Rev. S. TONKIN, B.D.—
The Withered Fig-tree 323

Rev. W. S. URQUHART, D.LITT.—
Glorifying Christ 548

Rev. D. WARK—
Note on the Meaning of θλίχις in the N.T. 429

Rev. J. H. WATT, M.A.—
Compromise and the New Testament . 410

Rev. T. H. WEIR, B.D.—
Gideon and his Three Hundred . . 232
1 Thessalonians 1^3 525

Rev. G. H. WHITAKER—
'In Season, out of Season' . . . 332

Rev. JOHN WILLCOCK, D.D.—
Matthew 25^{36} and 2 Timothy 1^{16-18} . . 43

Rev. H. A. WILLIAMSON, B.D.—
Text of Ezekiel 19^7 378
Jeremiah and Jesus 535

WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D.—
Sin, Hell, and Salvation 390
Mysticism: A New Distinction . . 476

Rev. ARTHUR W. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.—
The Name 'Paraclete' 43

SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
Almsgiving, Muhammadan	530
Angel of God	91
Apologetic, Earliest Christian	436
Atheist	1
Atonement	55, 243
Auto-suggestion and Religion	192
Bible and Church	340
Bible Stories, Unfinished	435
Bibles, Scottish	140, 279, 280
Bishop	89
Bond-servant	319
Buddhism	486
Business in the East	382
Certainty, N.T.	82
Christ and Apocalyptic Conceptions	289
,, Ascension	319
,, The Authority	340
,, Death of, Meaning	55, 243
,, Divinity	194
,, Double Morality in Teaching	482
,, Enthroned	182
,, Healing Ministry of	483
,, Historic Life	438
,, Incarnation	84
,, Newness of Teaching	529
,, Original Idea of the	149
,, Our Redemption	355
,, Resurrection	141, 523
,, and the Suffering Servant	150
,, 'Two Natures'	184
,, Uniqueness	529
,, and Universalism	482
,, Ways of losing	386
Christian Life, Nature of	245
Christianity	5, 145, 245
,, Coming Type	192
,, Essence of	193
,, Failure of	145
,, Finality	99
,, and Other Religions	485, 486
,, and Politics	31
Cleopas, Unnamed Companion of	233, 428
Commonplace	514
Communion Meditation	19
Compromise and the N.T.	411
,, ,, Human Nature	410
,, in Human History	411
Confucianism	486
Conversion	532
,, and Suggestion	383
Creeds	290
Darwinism and the Catholic Faith	51
Deacon	89
Deification	342
Diatessaron	377
Divorce	237
Edom	54
Egyptian Discoveries and *E.R.E.*	189
Elder Brother	436
Epiphany	140
Eternal Life	293, 342
Evangelist and Scholar	47
Evil, Problem of	389
Experience of God	4
,, Religious, and Psychology	460
Failure	422
Faith	292
Fall of Man	100, 242, 439
Fasting, Muhammadan	530
Fear	132
,, of God, False	479
Fellowship	385
,, with Christ	196
Fig-tree, Withered	323
Fishermen	480
Foreign Theology	23, 76, 127, 175, 217, 262, 326, 414, 457, 551
Forgiveness, Awesomeness of	220
Fourth Gospel, Development of Thought in	228, 246
,, ,, Discourses in	229
,, ,, Miracles in	229
Future Life	97, 241
Giving	421
God, Abundance of	37
,, Purpose in Christ	520
,, Reticence of	504
,, Secret of	36
God-blindness	1
Gomer	435
Goodness, Fear of	191
Gospel of: the Connections	387
Gospels, Apocryphal	373, 473
Gregory, Caspar René	124
Hastings, James	102, 171
Head-hunting	6
Healing	483
Heaven	98
Hebrews, Epistle	52, 58
Hell	99, 390
Herrmann of Marburg	321
Higher Criticism in Preaching	534
Hinduism	486
Hosea, Life of	435
Humbaba	38
Humility	434
Idealism, Contemporary	293
Immanuel	134
Immortality	242
,, Revelation of	171
Intelligence	334
Interest in Life	5
Isaac, Sacrifice of	138, 280
Islam, Ideals of	530
Jeremiah and Jesus	535
Jesus, Historic Life of	438
,, Jeremiah and	535
,, and Prayer	506
,, ,, Social Duty	388
,, the Wanderer	479
Jews and Christians	481
Jonah	435
Joy	133
Kingdom of God	338
Leper, Healing of	426
Liberty	339
Life, Race of	34
Loneliness	270
Luke's Gospel	306
Meekness	238, 434
Melanesia, Depopulation of	5
Memorial Sermon	171
Messiahship of Jesus	437
Middle Life, Temptations of	33
Mind and Body	480
Miracles	50
,, Belief in	337
,, in Fourth Gospel	228
Missions	5, 485
Muhammadanism	486
Mysticism	476
,, Christian	44
Neutrality	518
New Testament Canon	531
Nicoll, William Robertson	477
Noise	191
Pain	389
Paraclete	43
Paul and Aristophanes	151
,, in Art	527
,, Hymn of Love	488
,, Letters	527
Peace	49, 282
Person of Christ	146
Philippians, First and Second Epistles	106
Politics in the Pulpit	237
Poor	388
Prayer for Material Things	3
,, Muhammadan	530
Preacher	3, 47
Preaching, Systematic Theology and	359
Presbyter	89
Prohibition	285
Prophet	340
Psychical Research	341
Psycho-Analysis	196
Psychology, New	459
,, and Religion	382
Purgatory	98
Rabbinic Literature	482
Rabbis	481
Reality	439
Redemption, Nature of	7, 74
Religion as Power	291
,, ,, Worship	53
Revelation, Divine	278
,, Doctrine of	146
Revivalism, Personal	431
Righteousness of God	8
Ritual	487
Ruth, Book of	92
Sacrifices	487
Salvation	390
,, by Right Thinking	485
Scholar and Evangelist	47
Self-denial	197
Servant of the Lord	294, 440
Service	150
Seven	433
Shaddai	332
Sin	242, 335, 390
,, and Conservatism	93
,, Doctrine of	198
Smith, George Adam	56
Social Question	380

	PAGE
Soul	241
Speaker's Bible	478
Spiritual Healing	484
Spiritualism	526
Tasting	379
Teaching O.T. in Schools	533
Tears of Christ	275
Temptation	226, 259
Theology, Traditional	290
Thinking, Importance of Right	485
Time and Eternal Life	293
Trinity, Doctrine of	291
Troeltsch, Ernst	432
Truth in Jesus	438
Unbelief	1
Unrighteous Steward	470
Virginibus Puerisque	29, 77, 130, 176, 218, 266, 309, 361, 416, 465, 509, 552
Vocation	222
Women and Ministry	238
Wrath of God	214
Wrongs Righted	54

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Adams, The Scottish Church, 1500–1920: A Graphic Chart	351
Anglican Essays	339
Arrowsmith, Prelude to Reformation	409
Australia and Reunion	116
Bacon, The Teaching Ministry for To-morrow	502
Balfour, Earl of Aberdeen	299
Barry, St. Paul	385
,, Christianity and Psychology	394
Baudouin, Power Within Us	397
Baumgarten, Geschichte d. syr. Literatur	176
Begbie, Life Changers	431
Berry, Revealing Light	386
Bicknell, Christian Idea of Sin	198, 242
Bilby, Among Unknown Eskimo	303
Blunt, The Acts of the Apostles	545
Boreham, Shadows on the Wall	119
Boullaye, L'Etude Comparée des Religions, i.	265
Bowran, Christianity and Culture	546
Brayley, A Sunday School in Utopia	210
Brett, Way of Vision	303
Bristowe, The Oldest Letters	447
Brooks and Charles, Christianity and Auto-suggestion	397
Brown, Church in America	202
Browne, Religio Medici	69
Bruce, Psychology of Christian Life	347
Bryan, In His Image	120
Buch, Zoroastrian Ethics	298
Budden and Hastings, Local Colour, i.	376, 382
Bultmann, Geschichte d. syr. Tradition	217
Burkitt, The Early Syriac Lectionary System	547
Butler, Prayer in Experience	257
Buttenwieser, Job	64
Cannon, The 68th Psalm	208
Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist	302
Causse, Les Pauvres d'Israel	127
Champneys, A Different Gospel	50
Chandler, First-Hand Religion	2, 44
Chapman, Consciousness of Jesus	164
Charles, Adventure into Unknown	433
Children's Bible	72
Christian World Pulpit, vol. ci.	70
Clapton, Our Lord's Quotations from the O.T.	123
Clay, Hebrew Deluge Story	76
Clayton, Economics for Christians	499
Companion Bible	254
Cowen, Christ and Colosse	159
Crafer, Hosea	435, 448
Crane, Human Confessions	93
Crawford, Back to the Long Grass	251
D'Alés, Théologie de St. Cyprian	127
Dalman, Jesus-Jeschua	328
Dawbarn, Applied Philosophy	546
Dearmer, Lessons on the Way, ii.	452
Deissmann, Licht vom Osten	415
Denney, Letters	157
Dewey, Human Nature	15
Dorlodot, Darwinism	51
Douet and Ibrahim, L'Orient vu de l'Occident	127
Dougall and Emmet, Lord of Thought	65
Drown, Creative Christ	146
Education for Christian Service	250
Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse	326
Ellwood, Reconstruction of Religion	252
Emmott, History of Quakerism	401
Enriquez, A Burmese Arcady	304
Essays on Depopulation of Melanesia	5
Fichte, Addresses	297
Findlay, Realism of Jesus	195
,, Byways in Early Christian Literature	493
Findlay and Holdsworth, Wesleyan Methodist Society, iv.	67
Fitchett, Where Higher Criticism Fails	207
Fletcher, The Effective Evangelist	546
Formby, Unveiling of the Fall	439
Freud, Group Psychology	250
Furneaux, Psalms	348
Galloway, Religion and Modern Thought	193
Gardner, Christian Belief	492
Garvie, Beloved Disciple	157, 378
Gaskell, Dictionary of the Sacred Language of All Scriptures and Myths	544
Gebhart, Mystics and Heretics in Italy	12
Gillie, Minister in Modern World	497
Gilson, Philosophie Médiévale	25
Glover, Progress in Religion	67
Good, Jesus of Our Fathers	496
Goodwin, The Force of Intercession	117
Gore, Belief in Christ	149, 159
Gray, Men, Women, and God	305
Green, Personal Religion	257
Greig, Psychology of Laughter	403
Griffiths, Exodus in Light of Archæology	451
Haldane, Philosophy of Humanism	66
Hall, Eschatology	71
Hamilton, Forty Years On	61
Harper, Essentials of Religion	255
Harrison, Creed for 20th Century	449
Hartford and Macdonald, Bishop Moule	204
Hastings, Peace	49, 236, 282
,, Local Colour of the Bible	376
Haynes, Enemies of Liberty	496
Headlam, Life and Teaching of Jesus	337, 346
Hertzler, The History of Utopian Thought	498
Heuzé, Do the Dead Live?	341
Hobson, Unemployment	162
Holland, The Fourth Gospel	540
Hollander, Psychology	68
Hopkins, Origin and Evolution of Religion	498
Horton, Mystical Quest of Christ	395
Houston, Achievement of Israel	443
Hügel, Philosophy of Religion	98
Inge, Outspoken Essays, ii.	97, 110
Jacks, Religious Perplexities	145, 165
Jackson, Reasonable Religion	16
James, Personal Immortality	123
Jameson, Origin of the Synoptic Gospels	297

	PAGE
Jannaway, Palestine, and the World	121
Johnson, Anthropology and the Fall	545
Jones, N.T. in Modern Education	396
,, Spiritual Energies	291
,, When Jesus wrote on the Ground	118
Jordan, Ancient Hebrew Stories	209
Jowett, God our Contemporary	163
Kay, The Semitic Religions	539
Kingman, Place of Jesus	150
Kirkconnell, Unemployment	380
Knight, Founder of Quakerism	206
Knox, On What Authority?	147
Laing, Moral Problems	61
Lane, Evolution and Christian Faith	446
Langdon, Babylonian Wisdom	561
Lattey, Moses and the Law	14
Leckie, Fergus Ferguson	497
Lehmann-Issel, Grenzen	414
Leisegang, Pneuma Hagion	24
Levinthal, The Jewish Law of Agency	546
Lévy-Bruhl, Primitive Mentality	542
Lewis, The O.T. in the 20th Century	403
Liberal Evangelicalism	401
Life's True Values	448
Lippmann, Public Opinion	158
Loon, Story of Mankind	110
Lucka, Evolution of Love	250
McFadyen, Use of the O.T.	118
,, Interest of the Bible	203
McMillan, Education through the Imagination	544
Machen, N.T. Greek for Beginners	501
,, Christianity and Liberalism	406
Matthews, O.T. Life and Literature	501
Maxwell, A Psychological Retrospect of the Great War	498
Mercer, Assyrian Grammar	547
Micklem, Miracles and the New Psychology	121
Milligan, Here and There	119
Mills, Lhota Nagas	254
Moeran, M'Cullagh of Aiyansh	407
Montefiore, The O.T. and After	481, 494
Morgan, Emergent Evolution	494
Moritz, Arabien	457
Mumford, The Book of Job: A Metrical Version	501
Nairne, Every Man's Story of the O.T.	396
Nielsen, Der Dreieinige Gott	175
Oakeley, History and Progress	293
O'Flaherty, Health and Religion	483
Orchard, No More War	194
Palmer, Vital Verities	257
Papini, Story of Christ	442
Paul, Psychoanalysis	115
Paulus, Christusproblem der Gegenwart	262
Peabody, Paul	495
Peet, Egypt and the O.T.	398
Pell, Proof of the Existence of God	502
Peters, Psalms as Liturgies	64
Petitot, Ste Jeanne D'Arc	26
Petrie, Social Life in Ancient Egypt	543
Pfister, Psycho-Analysis	300
Philip, Devotional Literature of Scotland	161
Pickett, Hebrew Prophet	3
Piepenbring, Jésus Historique	264
Platt, Psychology of Social Life	114
Plooij, Primitive Text of the Diatessaron	347
Politeyan, Biblical Discoveries	169
,, N.T. Archæology	169
Pollock, Good Men Without Faith	348
Pourrat, Christian Spirituality	117
Pratt, Matter and Spirit	350
Prescott, Poetic Mind	12
Pringle-Pattison, Idea of Immortality	241
Provand, Puritanism in the Scottish Church	301
Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi	18
Quick, Liberalism, Modernism, and Tradition	160
Ragg, Dante Alighieri	72
Reid, Seeking the City	111
Religion and the Future	116
Religion and Life	351
Return of Christendom	112
Robertson, A Harmony of the Gospels	210
Robinson, Prophecy	444
,, St. Mark's Life of Jesus	73
Roscoe, Bakitara	402
,, The Banyankole	541
Rothschild, Reminiscences	205
Royden, Political Christianity	237
Sanders, O.T. History	168
Sanderson of Oundle	399
Saunders, Buddhism	163
,, Gotama Buddha	403
Scofield, In Many Pulpits	69
Scott, Hebrews	52
Simon, John Wesley and the Methodist Societies	540
Simpson, Altars of Earth	100
,, Man	252
,, Modernism and the Person of Christ	548
Slaten, What Jesus Taught	69
Smith, Moral Life of the Hebrews	487, 495
Snowden, Jesus as Judged by His Enemies	160
Sterrett, Modernism in Religion	166
Strachey, Landmarks in French Literature	443
Strohl, L'Evolution Religieuse de Luther	25
Tainsh, Christian Hypothesis	205
Talbot, Returning Tide of Faith	290
Tayler, Social Life	408
Taylor, Plato	118
Theologische Blätter	23
Thilo, Das Hohelied	26
Thomas, Things Big and Little	3
Thouless, Psychology of Religion	300
Unwin, Religion and Biology	170
Urquhart, Theosophy and Christian Thought	112
Vaerting, Dominant Sex	445
Vaux, Les Penseurs de l'Islam	127
Wace, The Story of the Resurrection	547
Wade, N.T. History	14
Walker, The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age	530, 542
Walpole, Early Latin Hymns	255
Ward, Kant	204
Wase, Life's Practical Philosophy	258, 485
Waterfall, Day Continuation School	447
Watkin-Jones, Holy Spirit	64
Weatherhead, After Death	499
Webb, Decay of Capitalist Civilization	299
Welsh, Classics of the Soul's Quest	204
White, Sea Gypsies of Malaya	114
Whiting, Dante	252
Whitla, Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel	1
Widgery, Comparative Study of Religions	409
,, Outlines of a Philosophy of Life	410
Wiener, The Prophets of Israel	353
Wild, Literary Guide to the Bible,	70
Will, La Liberté Chrétienne	127
Williams, Ecclesiastes	117
,, League of Nations To-day	445
Wobbermin, Das Wesen der Religion	27
Woods, Everyday Religion	245
Wright, A Student's Philosophy of Religion	63
Yehoash, The Feet of the Messenger	405
Younghusband, The Gleam	400

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
הַכֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ, הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל	235 f., 476 f.	חַיִּים, חַיִּין	188	מלאך, מלך	91
זַעַם	330 f.	מוֹרְשֵׁי לְבָבִי	330 f.	רָעָה	378

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
αἰτέω	379	*ἐμβατεύων*	151	*παράκλητος*	43
βάρος	333	*ἐρωτάω*	379	*παρουσία*	187
βρέφος	282	Κλεόπας	232	*σημεῖα*	228
γεύομαι	379	*μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου*	429	*ὑπωπιάζω*	140, 235
δυνάμεις	228	*οἴδατε*	107	*φορτίον*	333

TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gn iii. 8, 9	419	Hab iii. 2	33	Lk xiii. 1–5	215	Gal iv. 4, 5	190
Ex xxxii. 24	553	Zec xiii. 3	284	xiii. 22–30	245	vi. 1	511
Nu xi. 29	468	Mt i. 23	134	xiii. 33	429	vi. 2	310
xiii. 33	484	ii. 2	137	xiv. 15–24	245	vi. 2, 5	333
Dt xxiv. 1	238	iv. 1–11	259	xv. 16	479	vi. 7, 8	214
xxxiii. 16	513	v. 3	388	xv. 20	284	Eph iii. 20	37
Jg vii. 5, 6	232	v. 3, 5	433	xvi. 9	470	iv. 20, 21	438
1 S iii. 8	30	v. 4	434	xvii. 2, 3	268	v. 2	225
2 S ix. 1	516	v. 16	418	xvii. 20–37	187	Ph i. 10	29
1 K xix.	331	v. 32	237	xix. 41	275	i. 12	309
2 K iv. 26	526	v. 39, 41	196	xxiv. 9	234	i. 20, 21	548
v. 11, 12	514	v. 45	333	xxiv. 9, 10	234	ii. 4	273
1 Ch xxii. 7, 8	334	vi. 11	555	xxiv. 13–35	233, 428	ii. 12	429, 562
Neh viii. 10	554	vi. 28	77	xxiv. 17	234	iv. 8	484
Est iv. 14	557	vii. 11	214	xxiv. 18	233	iv. 13	218
Job v. 23	42	vii. 13–23	245	Jn i. 29	269	Col. ii. 7	183
xvii. 11	330	viii. 10	180	iv. 35	555	ii. 14	154
xxiii. 3	371	ix. 13	487	vii. 37, 38	329	ii. 18	151
xxxiii. 15	48	xi. 16–19	215	x. 11	314	ii. 23	151
Ps xxv. 14	36	xii. 7	487	xi. 9	272	1 Th i. 3	525
li. 17	487	xii. 30	518	xv. 11	133	1 Ti ii. 5	471
lxviii. 18	319	xii. 35	510	xvi. 23, 24	379	vi. 18	465
lxxiii. 15	453	xvi. 25	141	xix. 25	233, 234	2 Ti i. 10	171
lxxxv. 13	80	xxii. 1–14	244, 245	xx. 7	431	i. 16–18	43
cvi. 14, 15	3	xxii. 42	556	Ac ix. 6	222	iv. 2	332
cxviii. 24, 25	19	xxv. 27	479	xiii. 42	188	iv. 13	524
cxxx. 4	220	xxv. 31–46	43	xxvi. 28	563	He ii. 15	132
Pr xxiii. 7	484	xxvii. 46	380	Ro vi. 23	467	iv. 14	235, 476
Song ii. 12	509	xxviii. 6	276	ix. 5	331	viii. 5	80
Is i. 25	176	Mk i. 12, 13	226	xi. 28	177	xi. 1	316
iii. 10, 11	552	i. 39	426	xii. 11	178	xi. 13	92
vi. 8	367	iii. 20–35	259	xii. 16	484	xii. 1, 2	34
xxxii. 2	317	xi. 22, 23	323	1 Co i. 30	355	xii. 2	182
xl.–lxvi.	440	Lk i. 4	82	iii. 15	465	xiii. 5	270
xlix. 6	216	ii. 7	387	ix. 27	140, 235	xiii. 8	223, 364
liii.	441	ii. 19	362	x. 12	484	1 P ii. 12	130
lxiii. 1–6	54	ii. 34	86	2 Co iii. 17	190	ii. 16, 17	31
Ezk xix. 7	378	ii. 52	368	iii. 18	92	v. 8	416
xxxvi. 25	266	iv. 1–13	259	v. 16	190	2 P i. 1	319
xlviii.	198, 475	v. 5	422	v. 17	361	1 Jn v. 4	312
Hos vi. 6	487	vi. 20	388	ix. 7	421	Rev i. 14, 15	387
Jl ii. 28	365	vi. 29	196	xiii. 14	141	iii. 8	424
Am v. 25	101	vi. 35	131, 216	Gal iii. 16	284	xxii. 4	219
Mic vi. 8	486	x. 41, 42	430	iv. 4	84		

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'THE real atheist or total unbeliever is a man born God-blind or God-deaf. He is no more able to accept the supernatural than the music-deaf man is able to comprehend the meaning of a symphony of Beethoven or the colour-blind man to criticize a canvas of Raphael or Rubens. He stands before a page of Isaiah or Daniel, exactly in the same difficulty as my friend was in when he stood in the porch of his residence, and is equally insensible of his loss, save that the latter has learned that there is some defect in his vision which he cannot entirely comprehend, whilst the former is quite satisfied that the accumulated testimony of countless millions of Christians in all ages is the result of a delusion produced by credulous expounders of a fraudulent Bible; firm in his one religious belief that he alone with his few spiritually blind brethren is the only true interpreter of the Divine Will as revealed to His chosen people in the sacred oracles of God.'

That is a serious statement. Can a more serious statement be made? Who makes it? It is made by a very distinguished man of science. A new edition of *Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse* has been published (John Murray; 15s. net), edited by Sir William WHITLA, M.P., M.D., D.Sc., LL.D. And the editor prefixes a long introduction, in which he discusses 'the nature and the cause of unbelief.' In that introduction Sir William WHITLA makes the assertion that some men are born God-blind.

He refers to a friend of his who is colour-blind. He does not give his name, but calls him 'a highly intellectual Christian gentleman whom I have very intimately known for many years.' 'One bright autumn day we were standing in the porch of his house on a pavement of richly coloured encaustic tiles, when it occurred to me to try a very simple experiment by way of a test. There was a glorious blue tile at his feet, and plucking a single leaf of the small-leaved Virginia creeper of the brightest vermilion red, I placed it in the centre of the blue tile and asked him what he had to say about their colours. He laughed heartily and exclaimed, "Doctor, you have made a mistake this time; you thought to catch me, but this is a leaf and therefore I know it must be green." "But what about the colour of the tile?" "It is the same," he said, "as the leaf, only one is a little darker or lighter than the other; now when I look closely at them I think they are of the same colour which my wife called grey when she was showing me some ribbons lately."'

As this man is colour-blind, so, says Sir William WHITLA, another man is God-blind. And without any fault of his own. He was born so. The knowledge of God is a gift of

God. It is given to one man, from another it is withheld.

There are degrees of God-blindness. Some men, says Sir William WHITLA, are totally God-blind. These are they 'who go the entire length of denying the existence of a personal God and Saviour.' 'There are others (like the colour-blind individual, who is able to recognize some primary colours, or like the partially music-deaf man who can imperfectly learn a few tunes) who have some belief in an all-wise Deity, but who are incapable of believing in the inspiration of the Bible. Others there are again whose faith may be equal to accepting the reality of God and inspiration or prophecy, but are wholly incapable of conceiving of the possibility of miracle, and so on through the entire gamut of infidelity from atheism to deism, agnosticism, rationalism, materialism, free-thought, and the minor or more diluted and fanciful varieties of Unbelief as the fashionable clerical type masking under the name of Modernism.'

Is the God-blind man responsible for his blindness? He is not. There is nothing about which Sir William WHITLA is more emphatic than that. 'The God-blind man is probably an honest man, and I am convinced he is generally acting according to his light and with the aim which he thinks is the spread of what he calls "truth."' He is born God-blind, and it demands a Calvinism higher (more *hyper*) than even Sir William WHITLA's to believe that we are responsible for our birth.

Can God-blindness be cured? Again Sir William WHITLA is emphatic. It cannot be cured. 'Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind' (Jn 9^{32}). Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born God-blind.

It has often been tried. It has never been successful. For 'if you approach a typical sceptic by the ordinary methods of argument and reasoning and strive to convince him that everything in the world around him and in the heavens above him proclaims the reality and the existence of a personal God, he only laughs at you or pities your credulity and ignorance. He tells you, as he tells himself, that he sees all these things and that his own reasoning powers are quite as good as your own (indeed, he is almost certain to feel that his are better since he has probably accepted reason as his sole deity), and he will tell you that, having examined every theological argument, he has thoroughly convinced himself irrevocably by his reason that there is no proof of such a doctrine. Against the weapons of the Christian's reasoning and experience he is clad in triple mail.'

The problem which Sir William WHITLA has stated so unreservedly is dealt with also in a book which is noticed on another page—Bishop Arthur CHANDLER'S *First-Hand Religion* (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net). 'First-Hand Religion' is Bishop CHANDLER'S name for what we know as mysticism. And the question he asks is whether mysticism 'is the exclusive prerogative of a special sort of temperament, in such a sense that people of a different temperament are precluded from experiencing it.'

Now we may be sure that if any man may be a mystic, any man may be a believer in God. For the mystic, in Bishop CHANDLER'S idea and in ours, is the religious man at his most religiousness. Does Bishop CHANDLER believe that any man may be a mystic?

He does. God, he says, is willing to reveal Himself to any man. If a man is not a mystic, in other words, if a man does not find God, it is not because God has made him so that he is incapable of finding God, it is because he does not 'put himself into the right disposition to receive His revelations.' 'It is not people who are specially chosen by Him, or people who have a particular

psychic-physical temperament, that are recipients of His revelation, but those who wait for it with open and teachable minds.'

Messrs. Chapman & Hall have sent out a new edition of Mr. Gilbert THOMAS'S *Things Big and Little* (3s. 6d. net). Of the numerous volumes of essays on all sorts of subjects which are keeping the printers at work it is one of the least eccentric, and most spiritually strengthening. Among the essays there is 'A Word on Prayer.'

It is the old question whether prayer for material things is of any avail. But it is not pursued in the old way. To Mr. THOMAS the question is not will prayer for material things be answered, but should prayer for material things be offered.

He goes to Meredith—'by common consent among the greatest and best of men (though a recent biography has sought to modify the impression).' Meredith says bluntly, 'Prayer for material things is worse than useless; prayer for strength of soul alone avails.' But that is too dogmatic, says Mr. THOMAS. It is more than dogmatic, it is off the point. The question is not whether prayer for material things is useful or useless, it is whether it should be offered.

For prayer may be answered even when it should not have been offered. You remember that terrible sentence in one of the psalms ($106^{14.15}$), 'They lusted exceedingly in the wilderness, and tempted God in the desert. *And he gave them their request, and sent leanness into their soul.*' They who made that prayer had their answer. They received the very things they prayed for. But it would have been better for them if they had not received them.

Was the fault with God? The fault was clearly with them. The alternative for God was to let them perish in the wilderness. And that could not be. Moses reminded God once that that could not be. The faithfulness of God would have been discredited. His very power would have been doubted. They had to get what they prayed for. But they should not have prayed for it.

Why should they not have prayed for it? Because it was a material thing? Not so. Certainly not so. Christ taught His disciples to pray for material things. 'Give us this day our daily bread.' There is no more objection to prayer for material things than there is to prayer for spiritual things. '*Whatsoever* ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.' The question is not whether this thing or that thing should be asked. The question is whether the thing asked is asked 'in my name.' And we know that 'in my name' means according to the will of God.

It is certainly according to the will of God to grant us material things. Every good gift cometh down from above. It is His sun that rises in the morning; it is His rain that descends in the evening. But if the thing is selfish, then whether it is material or spiritual it is not in accordance with the will of God and should not be requested. The only advantage that the spiritual thing has over the material is that it is less likely to be selfish. And yet, how often is prayer offered for increase in spirituality with the half-conscious thought that the increased spirituality will bring increased honour.

The Hartley Lecture for 1922 was delivered by the Rev. Henry J. PICKETT, its subject *The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher.* Under that title it is now published and makes a volume of nearly three hundred pages (Holborn Publishing House; 5s. net).

The purpose is to magnify the office of the Christian preacher. The method is to show that

the Christian preacher is a prophet. What else he is or ought to be, Mr. PICKETT does not say. This is what he is meant above all else to be.

Now in order to be a prophet just one thing is necessary—personal touch with God. You may call this personal touch by your own name. Mr. PICKETT calls it experience. The preacher must have immediate experience of God. If he has not that, he has nothing, and is not properly a preacher.

For you must preach about God. And you cannot preach another man's experience of God. Only your own experience is preaching. That is what we mean by saying that personality is the telling fact in the pulpit. Personality does not mean eccentricity. It does not mean even individuality. It means such realization of God in one's own life as makes one (to use the ancient epithet) a man of God.

How does this realization of God arrive? Does it come from without or from within? The question is important. For to a wrong answer is due that cleavage in our attitude to Christ which is the most flagrant fact of our present-day Christianity. The Modernist says that it comes from within. What I experience—that, he says, is true. And since I have no experience of Jesus Christ as God, Jesus Christ is not God.

But the first experience of God is not from within. It is from without. So it was with the early disciples. First came Christ in His humanity. He made claims. He claimed to be the Son of God. The disciples accepted the claim. They believed on Him. Then followed the experience within. In the words of Bishop CHANDLER: 'Our Lord's character and life, works and teaching, made an impression on His disciples, a complex impression which, in so far as it caused them to follow Him, was a belief in Him, whether as prophet or Messiah. This belief was not a mere intellectual assent; it was an act by which they accepted Him as their Master and committed themselves to His service; and this moral and emotional side came gradually to express itself devotionally in prayer and spiritual experience of His power and presence in their lives; but a belief of some sort came first, and made the prayer and spiritual experience possible.'

Mr. PICKETT is of the same mind. You might have feared for him that he would fall into the pit which the Modernists have dug. He is better instructed. 'God,' he says, 'must be known, loved, obeyed. Much will have led to the definite "sense of God," which underlies vocation. What indeed is experience, but the growing force of many rills making up the main current or channel of personality? It is what the New Testament knows as conversion, and the following of Christ. The prophets knew God, not as a doctrine, but as a fact. As they followed their work, as they looked out over the conditions of their time, or as they suffered in their persons and homes, God stood for them as the reality behind, above, and over all. He and His made up for them the supreme concern of life.'

Then came the experience within, and the conviction which only experience within can bring. And out of conviction the constraint. 'Each of them passed through an experience, felt later by the "One greater than a prophet," so that they could have fittingly used His own great speech, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." And it is always questionable whether, until this "necessity is laid upon us," and the sense of "woe unto me" is felt, we ought to accept any other standard as constituting the call of God.'

Those are the steps. For it is the Modernist, ever crying out against a cataclysmic religion, who works by cataclysms. The rest recognize progress in the knowledge of Christ. First the fact of a Saviour, next the acceptance of His saving

power, then the experience of His work within, making for peace and joy, finally the full assurance of faith and the 'woe is me if I preach not the gospel.'

A book which drives one to disturbed thinking comes quietly from the Cambridge University Press, and bears the inoffensive title of *Essays on the Depopulation of Melanesia* (6s. net). The Essays are edited by Dr. W. H. R. Rivers. Sir Everard im Thurn writes a Preface. The essayists are three missionaries (Mr. W. J. Durrad, Mr. A. I. Hopkins, and Mr. W. C. O'Ferrall), two Resident Magistrates (Mr. C. M. Woodford and the late Sir William Macgregor); and a scientific anthropologist (Dr. Felix Speiser). Dr. Rivers himself writes the last essay, and carries the disturbance to its height.

What is it all about? It is about the depopulation of Melanesia. It is all about that. The title of the book is descriptive of its contents.

Well, why should Melanesia not be depopulated? What harm will it do if the native tribes of Melanesia diminish in numbers or even vanish off the earth? Will the commerce of the world suffer? These writers are not thinking of commerce. But the Melanesians belong to the coloured races. These writers are not thinking of colour. One and all, they are greatly concerned about the depopulation of Melanesia, and, one and all, it is because they are interested in the Melanesians.

The depopulation is due to Europeans. There may have been a tribe here or a tribe there which was decreasing in number before Europeans came. But the writers agree that the decrease as a whole is due to the effect which the arrival of Europeans has had on the natives. And it is not that the Europeans who have gone to Melanesia have deliberately set themselves to reduce the number of the natives, as has been the case (God forgive us all) in some lands. Alcohol and disease have been introduced, and have called for their victims, here as everywhere. But the depopulation in its extent and alarm is due to the missionaries and the magistrates.

The missionaries have substituted Christianity for the native religions. The magistrates have prohibited head-hunting. These are the causes of the depopulation which, with one consent, the writers in this book deplore.

Should Christianity not have been introduced into Melanesia? None of the writers says so. Perhaps Sir Everard im Thurn would have an open mind. Perhaps Dr. Speiser, the scientific anthropologist, if pressed, would say it should not. All the rest would affirm that there is no country on the face of the earth which would suffer by the introduction of Christianity.

It is the manner in which Christianity may be introduced into a country; it is the manner in which it has been introduced into Melanesia, that is the trouble. Dr. Rivers is most explicit.

The chief cause of the depopulation of Melanesia, says Dr. Rivers, is the lack of interest in life. We shall see what that means in a moment, when we come to head-hunting. For the present the point is that the chief interest of the natives has been a religious interest. And the question is, Will Christianity furnish that interest?

Dr. Rivers sees no reason why it should not. 'Experience,' he says, 'has amply shown that Christianity is capable of giving the people an interest in life which can take the place of that due to their indigenous religion.' In any case, now that Christianity has come, it has come to stay. Christianity is to be the religion of the Melanesians. For 'even if it were thought desirable to maintain the native religion in a modified form, it is highly improbable that there will be found people of our own culture sufficiently self-sacrificing to guide the progress of the people in the way which comes so naturally to the mission-

aries of the Christian religion.' The essential matter is that the indigenous religion must not be displaced in such a way as to destroy the interest of the natives in religion.

Two things are necessary—a united policy and sympathy. Hitherto, says Dr. RIVERS, 'one missionary has seen nothing but the work of the devil in some native institution and has willed its complete destruction; another, perhaps even of the same Mission, has seen in it a means of preparing the ground for the truth, and has, to some extent at least, encouraged its activities.'

This has puzzled the native and has led to dissimulation. 'If a new gospel is to be taken with success to such a people as the Melanesians, it is essential that the indigenous point of view shall be understood and that the misunderstanding to which the new views are inevitably subject shall be appreciated. Even if it were decided utterly to destroy the old religion there is no way in which these difficulties can be met so successfully as by a study of the old religion and of the mental attitude upon which the old religious practices rested, for this attitude must inevitably influence the reception of the new religion. If, on the other hand, it be decided to preserve such elements of the old religion as are not in conflict with the new, this study is even more essential. How can it be possible to decide whether a native practice shall be preserved unless the nature of the practice is thoroughly understood and its relations with other aspects of the native culture realised? Whatever the policy adopted towards the indigenous religion, it is of the utmost importance that this religion shall be understood and that, even if no concerted effort to study native religions is made, attempts in this direction made by individual missionaries shall be encouraged.'

But the chief cause of the depopulation of Melanesia is the prohibition of head-hunting. And the urgent question for missionary and for magistrate is what is to be done about that.

For that practice, says Dr. RIVERS, 'formed the centre of a social and religious institution which took an all-pervading part in the lives of the people. The heads sought in the head-hunting expeditions were needed in order to propitiate the ancestral ghosts on such occasions as building a new house for a chief or making a new canoe, while they were also offered in sacrifice at the funeral of a chief. Moreover, head-hunting was not only necessary for the due performance of the religious rites of the people, but it stood in the closest relation to pursuits of an economic kind. The actual head-hunting expedition only lasted a few weeks, and the actual fighting often only a few hours, but this was only the culminating point of a process lasting over years. It was the rule that new canoes should be made for an expedition to obtain heads, and the manufacture of these meant work of an interesting kind, lasting certainly for many months, probably for years. The process of canoe-building was accompanied throughout by rites and feasts which not only excited the liveliest interest but also acted as stimuli to various activities of horticulture and pig-breeding. As the date fixed for the expedition approached, other rites and feasts were held, and these were still more frequent and on a larger scale after the return of a successful expedition. In stopping the practice of head-hunting the rulers from an alien culture were abolishing an institution which had its roots in the religion of the people and spread its branches throughout nearly every aspect of their culture, and by this action they deprived the people of the greater part of their interest in life.'

Does Dr. RIVERS advocate the restoration of head-hunting? Not exactly. Not just human head-hunting. What he advocates is the gradual modification of the custom of hunting for human heads. He thinks that that should have been done. He thinks it might be done yet.

His words are these: 'At first sight it might seem a hopeless task, and so it would be if one

attended only to the outward practice obvious to the European observer and ignored the meaning which the institution of head-hunting bears to those who practise it. If we turn to this inner meaning, the case becomes less difficult. The essential motive for the head-hunting of Melanesia is the belief that on various important occasions, and especially on occasions connected with the chiefs, a human head is necessary as an offering to the ancestral ghosts. There is little doubt that the custom is a relic of an earlier practice of human sacrifice, and the head-hunting of the Solomons was but little removed from this, for till recently it was the custom to bring home from expeditions captives who were killed when some important ceremony created the need for a head. In other parts of the world there is reason to believe that, where human beings were formerly sacrificed, the place of the human victim has been taken by an animal, and even that the place of a human head has been taken by that of an animal. I have no doubt that it would have been possible to effect such a substitution in the Solomons, that officials with the necessary knowledge of native custom and belief, and with some degree of sympathy with them, could have brought about such a substitution and thus avoided the loss of life and money which has accompanied the suppression of head-hunting in the Solomons. At the same time they would have kept up the interest of the people in their native institutions until such time as the march of events produced new interests, including new religious interests, connected with the culture which was being brought to bear upon their lives.'

One interest would still have to be provided—the interest of canoe-making. 'The substitution of a porcine for a human head, while satisfying many of the ceremonial needs, would leave no motive for the manufacture of new canoes and the maintenance of this industry. Here it would be necessary to provide some new motive for the making of canoes.' Dr. RIVERS suggests the substitution of canoe races. No doubt in such a substitution the native canoe would be displaced by a boat of European build. But as with religion so also with boat-building. The picturesque canoe would disappear, 'but much as this would be regretted by the anthropologist or the artist, the new boat would be probably fully as efficacious in maintaining interest and zest in life and would thus contribute to the purpose which the writers of this volume have before them. Only, it is essential that the change should grow naturally out of native institutions and should not be forced upon the people without their consent and without any attempt to rouse their interest.'

The Nature of Redemption.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I.

THE work of Christ can be described in a number of terms—Redemption, Reconciliation, Propitiation—each of which presents some phase of it; but Redemption seems to be the most comprehensive of all, and in expounding it the others will in proper course receive attention.

1. According to Paul's teaching, redemption is deliverance from the guilt of sin, *or the wrath of God on sin*, the power of sin, or *the flesh*, the *law* as a restraint on, and yet a provocation to, sin, and *death* as the penalty of sin. As such it secures for man forgiveness, holiness, freedom, and blessedness, or, to use more theological terminology, justification, sanctification, emancipation, and glorification. Dealing with these aspects of redemption in the reverse order for a reason which will at once be seen, we may note (1) that the hope of resurrection rooted in the believer's

relation to Christ as the Living Lord robs death of its terrors; (2) that the place of the law in the believer's life is taken by, on the one hand, the new commandment of love to man, and, on the other, the new motive of the constraining love of Christ; (3) that the bondage to the flesh is ended by the believer's personal union with Christ by faith, so that he dies unto sin, and lives unto God in Christ; and (4) that the wrath of God against, the judgment of God on, guilty sinners is not annulled but removed in having its purpose fulfilled in *the righteousness of God*.

2. It is with the exposition of this conception that this article is especially concerned; but before passing from the subject of redemption in its varied aspects, attention may be called to the prominence of the idea of *substitution* in all Paul's thinking about redemption. Christ becomes a curse to redeem men from the curse of the law (Gal 3^{13}). He is born under the law that He may redeem them that are under the law ($4^{4.5}$). He comes in the likeness of sinful flesh that He may condemn sin in the flesh (Ro 8^{3}). God made Him sin (*i.e.* treated Him as a sinner) who knew no sin that we might become the righteousness of God in Him (2 Co 5^{21}). This righteousness of God is the alternative offered to the judgment of God on sin, the wrath of God against sin.

3. Paul shows *the universal need of redemption* by an inductive proof in Ro 1. 2. and 3, that 'all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God' (3^{23}), and have been thus 'brought under the judgment of God' (v.^{19}). They are all *guilty* before God. Against them is revealed the wrath of God (1^{18}). This conception of the wrath of God is an eschatological conception. The wrath of God is restrained by mercy in the present order: for He 'passes over the sins done aforetime in his forbearance' (3^{25}), and He shows 'the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering' (2^{4}). The mercy which spares is not, however, the grace that saves, for that has come only in Christ and His Cross. The wrath will be fully disclosed only in the Day of Judgment. As our thought to-day does not move in the same eschatological framework, we must think of God's judgment as the present reaction of His moral perfection against sin in the physical, social, moral, and religious consequences of sin, and of His wrath as the consummation of that reaction in His final decisive dealing with sin, whatever that may be.

4. The measure of God's judgment, or man's guilt before God, is not man's sense of his own guilt, for that is altogether inadequate to the actuality. As God sets the standard of what man ought to be, so God also measures the failure of man to reach that standard. Man is guilty, not as he thinks himself, but as he has fallen short of the glory of God, which means either the perfection of God for which man is destined, or God's approval. Man's need of redemption, then, is not to be limited by his sense of that need, but by his failure to fulfil God's purpose for him of likeness to, and fellowship with, Himself. If we are to understand Paul, we must substitute a religious objectivity for a moral subjectivity. It is not man's conscience, but God's purpose for man, that is the standard by which man is to be judged, as needing redemption; that, too, must be the measure of the forgiveness which in Christ is offered to man. A man's personal blameworthiness may be measured by his conscience, but not the guilt before God which God's forgiveness annuls. Accordingly, the sacrifice which saves must not be measured by even the best man's sense of his sinfulness, but by Christ's consciousness as Son of God of what the judgment of the holy love of God is regarding the sin of the race.

II.

1. We must now concentrate our attention on the conception of *the righteousness of God*, which has as its antecedent *the propitiation of Christ's blood*, and as its consequent the *reconciliation* of man with God with the other blessings described in Ro 5^{1-11}, which follow from that *reconciliation*. (*a*) The righteousness of God is both 'the righteousness valid with God' (Luther) for man's forgiveness, and 'a righteousness agreeable to the nature of God' (Baur) in forgiving. It is not only the divine activity corresponding to the divine attribute, but also the condition before God into which man by that activity is brought when he believes. It is a gift of God to faith, 'the righteousness out of faith' (Ro 10^{6}), and is, therefore, not a righteousness which man can acquire for himself by his works (v.^{3}). It is not man's, achieved by works, but God's, bestowed on faith. It is not contrary to God's own character

so to deal with man, for God displays His righteousness in saving man (cf. Ps $36^{6.7}$ 98^{2} 103^{6}). Because God is righteous, and not in spite of His being righteous, He 'reckons righteous him that hath faith in Jesus' (3^{26}). 'God's righteousness may mean His attribute, His exercise of that attribute, and the effect of that exercise in man' (*Century Bible*, Romans, p. 93). The central manifestation of that righteousness is the Cross. (*b*) As this righteousness of God has been sometimes described as a legal fiction—a make-believe in which God thinks and treats man as other than he is—the misconception must be removed. It is possible only if chapters 3 and 4 are separated from chapter 6, the *legal* from the *mystical* aspect of Paul's theology. In the mystical aspect he is expounding his own personal experience; in the legal he is engaged in an apologetic and controversial task. Both were significant for Paul, but the mystical assuredly had the greater value. We must not separate what Paul only distinguishes. Paul does not represent God as thinking of men who have not kept the law as having met all its demands, as pronouncing any legal judgment upon them as guiltless in respect of the law. Nay, forgiveness involves, and does not exclude, the judgment of guilt. God treats sinners as righteous in withholding punishment and conferring favour, not because they will become righteous by His grace, so anticipating their merits as the ground of His action, but because their faith brings them into such relation to Christ that they will become all that God means them to be. (*c*) Paul speaks of the righteousness of God instead of forgiveness, as we usually do, for two reasons: *Firstly*, as a Pharisee he desired to attain righteousness—the divine approval of his fidelity to the law—but failed. As a believer, God reckons him as righteous, as by his faith placed in that relation to God which he had vainly striven to attain by the works of the law. He could not, even as a believer, abandon the conviction that righteousness is a necessity, a conviction that every man who takes morality and religion seriously as he did must share with him. *Secondly*, the forgiveness which comes to him in Christ is not a *passing over* of his sins in good nature and moral indifference; it is because Christ is set forth as *propitiatory*, consistent with God's own righteousness, His assertion, vindication, and satisfaction of His own moral perfection. The law, as the expression of God's righteousness, is not made of none effect through faith, for God's judgment and wrath, as well as His grace, are confirmed and harmonized in His righteousness as revealed in Jesus Christ. Paul's conscience was fully satisfied in God's forgiveness.

2. The consequent of the righteousness of God, or justification by faith, is *reconciliation* between God and man. (*a*) 'The blissful effects of justification partially possessed and gradually to be realized are reconciliation with God, the enjoyment of God's favour, the gladness inspired by the hope of sharing in the holiness and blessedness of God, and the confirmation of this hope in the endurance of trial cheerfully, and the discipline of character which this endurance involves' (Ro 5^{1-4}; see *Century Bible*, Romans, p. 146). These blessings are assured to the believer by God's Spirit filling his heart with the sense of God's love, shown in Christ's death. What God has done in that death is the guarantee that He will do even what may be greater in the life of Christ in the believer. Confident of the future, the believer can now rejoice in this communion with God (vv.$^{5-11}$). All this man experiences when his estrangement from God ends, and he gives up his distrust of and disobedience to God. As man's reconciliation with God is a subjective effect of the objective fact of justification, statement passes into appeal in Paul's exposition. Believers are exhorted to have peace with God, and to rejoice in hope of the glory of God, and even in their tribulations (vv.$^{1-3}$). The question which now concerns us is this: Is this reconciliation only on the part of man, or is it mutual? It is true that throughout the N.T. men are exhorted to be reconciled, but that is because God in Christ is preached as reconciled inasmuch as He is 'not reckoning unto men their trespasses,' and this is surely 'the word of reconciliation' (2 Co 5^{19}). V.^{21} in this passage states the divine fact on which the human duty in v.^{20} depends. A reconciled God calls on men to be reconciled. For regarding the reconciliation as mutual the following reasons can be given: (i) In Ro 11^{28} 'enemies' and beloved are contrasted in such a way that the former must be regarded as objects of God's hostility as the latter are of His affection. (ii) In Ro 5^{10} it is stated that 'we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son' even 'while we were enemies'—that is, before the process of

man's reconciliation to God had begun. (iii) If God's wrath may be spoken of, surely no less His reconciliation. (iv) This conclusion also follows from the description of Christ's death as *propitiatory*, which can only mean that God is set forth in that death as propitiated; that is, Christ's death as an adequate and effective manifestation of God's righteousness makes possible a change not in God's disposition or purpose towards men, but in His attitude; the pain of His judgment on men is changed to the joy of His favour to men.

3. While it may be admitted that the word *redemption* does not necessarily mean deliverance by *ransom*, so that it is not necessary for us to ask what was the ransom, or to whom was it paid, as one of the earliest of the theories of the atonement did; and that the word reconciliation, even if mutual between God and man, does not itself raise the problem of expiation or atonement; yet the term, *the righteousness of God*, as describing the gift of God to man in Christ, does indicate that forgiveness will come in such a way as not to be inconsistent with God's holiness and His consequent judgment on sin. As God's judgment in the past had been tempered with mercy, as forgiveness was now being offered without judgment on men, that necessary connexion between God's holiness and His judgment on sin might be put in doubt. That doubt must be removed so completely and finally that no possibility of misunderstanding might remain; that doubt is removed by the revelation in Christ Jesus, 'whom God set forth *propitiatory* through faith by his blood' (3^{25}). (*a*) The Greek word, ἱλαστήριον, is usually a noun, meaning 'the place or vehicle of propitiation,' but originally it is the neuter of an adjective. Although in the LXX and He 9^5 it is used for the lid of the ark of the covenant, on which the Shekinah rested, and which was sprinkled on the Day of Atonement with the blood of the sacrifice, yet, strong as are the arguments for this meaning, on the whole it is improbable that Paul would have introduced an allusion so obscure to the majority of the readers without some fuller explanation. No evidence of the use of the word in the sense of propitiatory victim has been produced; and there is an advantage in taking the word as an adjective in the most general sense possible. The word itself is not decisive for the meaning in Paul's mind. This, at least, it must mean, that the death of Christ is that which *reveals* God as propitious to sinners, and even, we must add, renders God propitious, as showing both God's wrath against sin and the appeasement of that wrath. Paul is not solitary in the use of the word in connexion with the work of Christ. The writer of the First Epistle of John declares that Christ 'is the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world' (2^2). He returns to the fact, and states its motive: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (4^{10}). According to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'it behoved Christ in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι) for the sins of the people' (2^{17}).

(*b*) Two circles of ideas seem here to intersect —the one legal, the other ritual. Many scholars maintain that the Old Testament conception of sacrifice excludes the idea of penal substitution or satisfaction; the victim does not bear the penalty, and so meet the demands of the law. By sacrifice communion with God is maintained, or, if interrupted by any transgression, restored. Even if this be so, it must be admitted that the sin and the trespass offering had reference to breaches of the law, and were regarded as the divinely appointed means of securing God's forgiveness. That the Psalmist disclaims the intention of seeking to recover God's favour by a sacrifice (a burnt-offering, Ps 51^{16}) shows that others so regarded sacrifice. While he is content with offering the sacrifice of a 'broken spirit,' and is sure that God will not despise 'a broken and a contrite heart' (v.[17]), the prophet, in his description of the Suffering Servant, explicitly states that it pleased Yahveh 'to make his soul a guilt-offering' (Is 53^{10}), and the dominant thought is that of penal substitution and satisfaction (v.[5]). It is highly probable that we have this same combination of ideas here. Paul may have been thinking not only of the sacrifices of the Jewish ritual, but also of some of the human sacrifices familiar from Greek and Roman story. It is true that he does not give the prominence to the idea of sacrifice which the Epistle to the Hebrews does; but he does refer to Christ's death as a sacrifice. He describes Christ as the passover lamb (1 Co $5^{7.8}$). In his account

of the Lord's Supper Christ is represented as the sacrifice of the new covenant (1 Co 11^{25}). It is not improbable that in Ro 8^{3} the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας is rightly rendered in the R.V. '*as an offering* for sin.' His references to the blood of Christ (Ro 5^{9}, Eph 1^{7} 2^{13}, Col 1^{20}) and his connecting of forgiveness with the death of Christ (1 Co 15^{3}, 2 Co 5^{21}, Eph 1^{7}, Col $1^{14.\ 20}$) confirm the conclusion that Paul did habitually think of the death of Christ as a sacrifice, and that he would have accepted the general principle laid down by the Epistle to the Hebrews (9^{22}), 'without shedding of blood there is no remission.' It does not follow, however, that he had fused together the two conceptions of sacrifice and of penal substitution and satisfaction, and that he explained to himself the efficacy of sacrifice by its character as penal. We have no convincing evidence on that point. What is certain, that he did think of Christ's death under both conceptions without making any distinction. We are not warranted in weakening the force of this conclusion by the explanation that in sacrifice the sprinkling of the blood on the altar, signifying the presentation of the life to God, was the important matter, not the shedding of the blood signifying the death of the victim; for in the N.T. use of the sacrificial imagery it is the blood-shedding, and not the blood-sprinkling alone, on which the stress is often laid. The two ideas go together, for the shedding makes the blood available for the sprinkling. Christ's offering unto God was certainly His holy obedience, but He rendered that in suffering death. In Paul's teaching at least we must admit the conception of penal substitution and satisfaction. It is the Epistle to the Hebrews which gives prominence to the other thought. If vicarious suffering is not the sole element in Christ's sacrifice, but representative submission is also included, yet it is an essential element, and, without setting aside the teaching of the N.T., it cannot be got rid of from the Christian doctrine of the Atonement.

(*c*) A misunderstanding of the phrase 'through faith' must be removed. Paul does not mean that faith gives to the death of Christ a meaning as propitiatory that it would not otherwise have had. It is propitiatory as objective fact, but the application and appropriation of the fact for individual salvation is by faith; and to unbelief, this value, real as it is, is not disclosed. May we not add that it is only as a man experiences the Christian salvation that he can interpret Christ's sacrifice?

(*d*) What is the *rationale* of the Cross for Paul? 2 Co 5^{21} is the decisive statement. On the Cross the sinless was treated as sin. The consequences of the sin of mankind were appointed to Him by God, and were accepted by Him. This is the meaning of Is 52^{13}–53^{12}. Paul avoids saying that Christ was made a sinner, or that He was accursed (Gal 3^{13}), and probably he would not have said that He was held guilty or punished for us; but that He suffered for us, even instead of us, he does undoubtedly teach. This suffering he regards as a perfect manifestation of God's judgment on sin, more adequate for God's demand and man's need than all other judgments could be. As a manifestation of judgment it is a vindication of God's righteousness, the consistency of His action with His character as perfect. Such a vindication has its historical necessity in the danger of men misunderstanding the tempering of God's judgment by His mercy, or the forgiveness of sin, apart from such a judgment. But for Paul it seems to have an eternal necessity in the character of God Himself. It was only by showing Himself propitiatory in Christ's blood that He could be righteous, while reckoning righteous those who have faith in Christ (3^{26}).

(*To be concluded.*)

Literature.

THE ITALIAN MYSTICS.

Mr. Edward Maslin Hulme has translated into English *L'Italie Mystique*, written by M. Emile Gebhart, and has given it the title of *Mystics and Heretics in Italy* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

Nicholas-Emile Gebhart (to give him his full name) was born in 1839 at Nancy, the old capital of Lorraine. He spent fourteen years as Assistant Professor of Foreign Literature in his native town, and then twenty-six years as Professor of Foreign Literature at the Sorbonne in Paris. He was elected to the French Academy in 1904, and died in 1908, his place in the Academy being taken by Poincairé. His chief books are a study of *Rabelais*, a work on *The Origins of the Renaissance*, *Mystic Italy*, and two appreciations—one of *Botticelli*, one of *Michelangelo*. He also wrote an historical novel, *Around a Tiara*, which was not successful.

'The first sight of him was disconcerting enough: a head quite round in shape, cheeks and neck fat and puffy; one would have sworn he was some Rabelaisian canon or monk. Only the small, lively and mobile eye, that was wont suddenly to light up, betrayed the mind that watched beneath this sleepy appearance, a mind that was curious, observant and amused with the things of life.'

Of the *Mystic Italy*, now translated, he says: 'I purpose in this book to describe the heroic period of that history. The first atttempts at heresy or schism, Arnold of Brescia, Joachim of Flora, Francis of Assisi and his religious creation. Frederic II. and the civilization of southern Italy, the revival of Joachimism in the institutions of Assisi, the militant work of the Holy See between the times of Innocent III. (1198–1216) and Boniface VIII. (1294–1303), will occupy our attention one after another. At the same time I shall indicate what part Italian faith played in the renovation of the arts and poetry, and what beam, sent forth by the great Christians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, rested on the cradle of Nicholas and John of Pisa, Giotto, Jacopone of Todi, and Dante.'

The book appears to be translated with affectionate care. The translator has had his difficulties: 'There is no English for Ronsard's *Mignonne, allons voir si la rose*; nor for his *Quand vous serez bien vieille, au soir, à la chandelle*; and there does not seem to be an equivalent in English for many passages in Gebhart's subtle and musical prose, every line of which has been as delicately pondered as though it were poetry.' But he has overcome. The translation is easy to read and evidently conveys the author's meaning.

The most original and interesting part is the chapter on the Emperor Frederic II. M. Gebhart has not solved the mystery surrounding that mysterious personality of the Middle Ages, but he has made him live. Even the Dante chapter has originality and vitality. With Dante, says M. Gebhart, 'the supreme sin, that which he punishes with crushing contempt, is not heresy, nor unbelief, which he has shown, by the very disdain and lofty countenance of the damned, to be superior to hell; it is *viltà*, the timid renunciation of active duty, devotion, and life, the cowardice of pope Celestine, more criminal than the treason of Judas.'

THE POETIC MIND.

The most sustained and systematic discussion of what poetry is and where it comes from that has been issued in our day is to be found in a volume entitled *The Poetic Mind* (Macmillan), written by Frederick Clarke Prescott, Professor of English in Cornell University. This is how the author himself explains the purpose of his book: 'I wish to attempt some further explanation of poetic vision, of the poetic imagination and poetic creation, of the poetic madness, and of the prophetic nature and function of poetry. I intend, however, not so much to present any novel theories of my own on these subjects, as to bring together and systematize views which have long been held in regard to poetry—which have been expressed, often figuratively and obscurely, by the poets themselves, in various ages and in many books—which, therefore, have remained scattered and, to have their full value, must be brought together from a wide reading of literature—which must be interpreted and correlated, often indeed translated from the language of poetry to that of prose.'

'In proceeding thus,' he continues, 'I shall

have often to quote at length from these sources; and I beg the reader not merely to pardon the constant quotation, but to attend particularly to the quotations as the best possible evidence and as more authoritative and usually more important than the text.'

Should that statement suggest to any one that the book is a collection of quotations, the suggestion may be dismissed. Professor Prescott has written the book himself. The quotations are not too numerous, and they are always illustrative, solely illustrative, of his writing.

Professor Prescott's fundamental idea is that poetry is beyond the control of the poet. It is outside his will, and even his consciousness, as surely as his dreams are. Indeed there is a close affinity between the poet and the dreamer. 'Poets are often, if not always, great dreamers, whether by night or by day. Goethe, Blake, Lamb, Coleridge, De Quincey, and many others recount vivid, beautiful, or horrible dream experiences, sometimes in sleep, sometimes in waking, often ambiguous between the two. This suggests that poetry and dreams are products of the same imaginative operation. Tolstoi in his Souvenirs writes of lying warm in bed and "losing himself in delicious dreams and recollections." He looks fixedly at the fold in the counterpane and sees before him his sweetheart, as clearly as when he left her an hour before. "In imagination," he says, "I talked with her, and this conversation, though entirely lacking in sense, at least gave me indescribable pleasure, because it was filled with affectionate *thee's* and *thou's*. These dreams were so distinct that the pleasurable emotions prevented my sleeping," etc. The "dreams" then were in waking, but they might easily have been continued in sleep, and whether true dreams or only reverie or vision, they might equally serve as material for a scene in fiction. Thus reverie often runs into dream and dream encroaches on waking life. Poe confused the experiences of sleep and waking: "The realities of the world affected me as visions, and as visions only, while the wild ideas of the land of dreams became, in turn,—not the material of my everyday existence,—but in very deed that existence solely and in itself." "To dream," he says, "has been the business of my life." Such cases, of which there are many, lead Chabaneix to suppose that the poet is one in whom the dream state obtrudes anomalously into waking life. It would be better, however, in my opinion, to regard both dream and waking vision as the products of the same mental operation occurring naturally and indifferently in either sleep or waking.'

Is there, then, nothing in the poet himself that gives origin or even opening to the poem? Yes. There is desire. It is so with dreams. 'At any rate I have no doubt that Freud is right when properly understood; at least—the conclusion need go no farther than this for the present purpose—that the great majority of dreams are open or concealed expressions of the desires. Apart from the evidence adduced by the psychologists I should take this view from my own observation, and from evidence in language and literature. In language to realize one's widest dream is to obtain one's fondest wish. In literature dreams are oftenest of the type of Isaiah: "It shall even be as when a hungry man dreameth, and, behold, he eateth; but he awaketh, and his soul is empty: or as when a thirsty man dreameth, and behold, he drinketh; but he awaketh and, behold, he is faint, and his soul hath appetite." The following is typical in English literature:

The wery hunter, sleping in his bed,
To wode ayein his mynde goth anoon;
The Juge dremeth how his plees ben sped;
The carter dremeth how his cartes goon;
The rich of gold; the knight fight with his foon;
The seke met [dreams] he drinketh of the tonne;
The lover met he hath his lady wonne.'

It is so with poetry. 'Convincing as evidence are many poems of which the following sonnet by Alice Meynell is a type. If in this the reader will observe carefully how the desire, impeded from action, leads to the dream (as also to the poem itself) he will fix a relation which is illustrated again and again in literature.

I must not think of thee; and tired yet strong,
I shun the love that lurks in all delight—
The love of thee—and in the blue of Heaven's height,
And in the dearest passage of a song.
Oh, just beyond the sweetest thoughts that throng
This breast, the thought of thee waits hidden yet bright;
But it must never, never come in sight;
I must stop short of thee the whole day long.

But when sleep comes to close each difficult day,
When night gives pause to the long watch I keep,
And all my bonds I needs must loose apart,
Must doff my will as raiment lay away,—
With the first dream that comes with the first sleep,
I run, I run, I am gathered to thy heart.'

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A valuable book on the New Testament has been published by Messrs. Methuen. The author is the Rev. G. W. Wade, D.D., Senior Tutor of St. David's College, Lampeter. Dr. Wade's scholarship is already widely recognized on account of his articles in the Dictionaries and his book on the Old Testament. This book is meant to follow the Old Testament book. Its title is *New Testament History* (18s. net), just as the title of the other was 'Old Testament History.'

But it is a much larger and a much more important book. It is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the History by giving an account of the topography of Palestine, the Roman Empire—its provincial system and the conditions in the Empire conducive to the diffusion of Christianity, the Jewish institutions, and the prevailing ideas and methods of Jewish historians.

In the second part we reach the text of the New Testament writings, and are furnished with a full and minute description of the present state, first of textual, and then of documentary, criticism—in other words, of the Lower and the Higher Criticism.

The third part is the history proper. After a preliminary note on the chronology (which fills ten pages), we have the ministry of Jesus according to the earliest sources, followed by an additional note on His ministry according to the Fourth Gospel, then the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age, and, last of all, a long section on theological development in the New Testament, the development being traced separately through the teaching of Jesus, the teaching of the Primitive Church, the teaching of Revelation, the teaching of St. Paul, the teaching of Hebrews, and the teaching of the Johannine Writings.

The book contains, further, ten maps and plans and a carefully compiled index.

Is all this only a catalogue of contents? Only so could any idea be conveyed of what this book is. And it is enough. We know that Dr. Wade is thoroughly furnished for such work as this. We know that his ability and his industry keep step. We know that he writes clearly. We know that it is to-day's (if not to-morrow's) attitude that we shall find adopted in his book. And all we need do now is to give an example. This is what he says on a matter much discussed at the moment:

'In forming a judgment upon the qualities of *Acts* as a history, a recognition of these exceptional merits of St. Luke must be qualified by considerations in part affecting generally writers of his time and race, and in part peculiar to him as an individual author. In the first place, he was very tolerant of inconsistencies in what he wrote, and allowed discrepancies, sometimes slight, but at other times of more importance, to exist side by side; he was not very critical of the materials at his disposal, or exacting in his estimate of evidence; and he was much attracted by stories of the marvellous. And secondly, in composing his history, he did not view his subject from a detached standpoint and in a dispassionate spirit, but he was inspired by the desire to commend a cause in which he was deeply interested, and with some of the leaders of which he had been closely associated; and he was consequently subject to the temptation of putting upon what he included in his work as favourable a colouring as possible.'

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., has edited a volume of essays by Fathers of the Society of Jesus on *Moses and the Law* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net). The contributors are unknown to us, but they may be well known within their own Communion. In any case they seem to be competent. But they are hampered. They are hampered by the Biblical Commission of 1909. And they feel it. The very first of them makes this confession: 'It need hardly be said that we have no desire to put forward anything that is not in entire accord with the decisions there arrived at.' But for the Commission it is clear that we should have had something on 'the Days of Genesis' more in accordance with scholarship. Mr. Lattey himself throws the results of modern criticism of the Old Testament

to the owls—and can go forward with more equanimity.

But the writer of the article on the Flood finds himself in serious difficulties. 'Scripture does not, then, require the whole world to have been covered by the Flood. We can interpret Genesis easily to mean a partial Flood. It must be admitted that the Fathers suppose the former, but their consensus here is not Tradition in the strict sense. On this point we cannot do better than quote from the admirable commentary on Genesis published in 1910 by the learned Capuchin, Father Hetzenauer, Professor of Exegesis at the Papal Seminary of St. Apollinaris, Rome (pp. 169, 170). We translate from the Latin:

'It is true that the Fathers, theologians, and exegetes of the Church, up to the seventeenth century, commonly taught the geographical universality of the Flood; but their doctrine on this point is not Tradition in the strict sense. We must carefully distinguish. If the Fathers teach anything with a unanimous consensus, and, moreover, *as belonging to faith or morals* (Leo XIII.), or if, directly or indirectly, they put forward the explanations which they give *as the sense of the Church*, then their unanimous consensus shows the true Tradition of the Church and the true sense of the Bible, and is binding upon all Catholic exegetes. But if they explain some passage of the Bible with, it is true, a unanimous consensus, but neither directly nor indirectly put forward this explanation as the sense of the Church, then we have the common opinion of the teachers of those times, but not Tradition in the strict sense. And we can desert such a private opinion of the Fathers, theologians, and exegetes, as Leo XIII. and Pius X. show us. Now, the Fathers, neither directly nor indirectly, put forward the geographical universality of the Flood as the sense of the Church, or as a doctrine of faith or morals; therefore Tradition in the strict sense does not teach this universality.'

PALESTINE.

A book for children is a book for parents. So nearly always. So certainly when the writer is Miss Gertrude Hollis. For the gift of charm is hers. And charm in writing is more than charm in manner, since so many more are pleased by it.

Miss Hollis has written a book on Palestine. She calls it (for titles are now scarce) *The Land of the Incarnation* (Wells Gardner; 5s.). It contains a history of the land and an account of its people. The history is carried down to the Great War. The people too are described to date. Thus in Jerusalem to-day:

'Perhaps we may meet a man with thick long hair like a woman, dressed in a straight black garment, and wearing a tall, straight black hat with a brim at the top. He is a priest of the Greek Church, and also, if his hat has the brim, a monk from one of the monasteries. Another man in a rough brown cassock, with a cream-coloured cord round his waist, and sandals on his feet, is one of the Franciscan friars, who take care of the Holy Places, perhaps an Italian or Spaniard.

'There are, perhaps, three women wearing their veils quite differently, and another who does not wear a veil at all. This one, whose face is quite covered, is a Syrian Mohammedan; the one with both eyes visible, and a curious uncomfortable-looking metal tube down the nose, is an Egyptian; and the one who has only one of her eyes in sight must be a Druse with a secret religion. The unveiled woman must be a Jew or a Christian.

'The boy in the striped blanket kind of cloak, with the thick ruff round his neck, bare arms and legs, and perhaps a whistle made of a reed in his hand, is a shepherd who looks just as David looked when Samuel called him to be king of Israel; and the man in the same shaped cloak, covered with fish-scales, is getting his living on the Sea of Galilee just as the Apostles did in the time of our Lord.'

Professor John Dewey has written an Introduction to Social Psychology under the title of *Human Nature and Conduct* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). Professor Dewey is the head of the Pragmatists, and he never writes without commending Pragmatism. Here we have it most manifestly at the end. 'Morals is connected with actualities of existence, not with ideals, ends and obligations independent of concrete actualities. The facts upon which it depends are those which arise out of active connections of human beings with one another, the consequences of their mutually intertwined activities in the life of desire, belief, judgment, satisfaction and dissatisfaction.'

Now pragmatism certainly gives him the opportunity of deciding between the claims of individual and social ethics. For there are two schools at present of social reform. 'One bases itself upon the notion of a morality which springs from an inner freedom, something mysteriously cooped up within personality. It asserts that the only way to change institutions is for men to purify their own hearts, and that when this has been accomplished, change of institutions will follow of itself. The other school denies the existence of any such inner power, and in so doing conceives that it has denied all moral freedom. It says that men are made what they are by the forces of the environment, that human nature is purely malleable, and that till institutions are changed, nothing can be done. Clearly this leaves the outcome as hopeless as does an appeal to an inner rectitude and benevolence. For it provides no leverage for change of environment. It throws us back upon accident, usually disguised as a necessary law of history or evolution, and trusts to some violent change, symbolized by civil war, to usher in an abrupt millennium. There is an alternative to being penned in between these two theories. We can recognize that all conduct is *interaction* between elements of human nature and the environment, natural and social. Then we shall see that progress proceeds in two ways, and that freedom is found in that kind of interaction which maintains an environment in which human desire and choice count for something. There are in truth forces in man as well as without him. While they are infinitely frail in comparison with exterior forces, yet they may have the support of a foreseeing and contriving intelligence. When we look at the problem as one of an adjustment to be intelligently attained, the issue shifts from within personality to an engineering issue, the establishment of arts of education and social guidance.'

Those two quotations give us the 'hang' of the book. But there are many other good things in it well expressed. In particular there is a comparison between Epicureanism and Utilitarianism, very telling and very true.

How are you to occupy your Girl Guides of an evening? *Friends of all the World* (C.M.S.; 1s. net) will instruct you. The author is Mar-La T. Foster.

Professor George Jackson, B.A., D.D., has been in the habit of contributing an article every fortnight to the *Manchester Guardian*. He has now published a selection from these articles. The title of the book is *Reasonable Religion* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net).

Reasonable religion is not the opposite of mystical religion. It is religion that can be offered to the average man, the average reader of the *Manchester Guardian*. And it is religion. Dr. Jackson is as sound on 'the fundamentals' as a Scottish theologian—for whom, by the way, he has much respect; one part of the volume is given to his praise. Thought and language — all is modern. We see now, if never clearly before, that a man may be a Modernist and yet believe heartily in the deity of Christ and in the resurrection from the dead on the third day.

Professor Jackson must allow us to break a lance with him over A. B. Davidson. After quoting something from Denney, he says: 'It is doubtful if Davidson could have ever said that; it is doubtful, indeed, if he would have thought the better of himself for being able to say it. It was as natural for him to be cautious as it was for Denney to be frank. All through the great controversy in which Robertson Smith was the central figure he did no more to save his brilliant pupil from the wolves than cast for him a silent vote. Perhaps, as Dr. Strahan suggests, he was repelled by Smith's pugnacity and what he thought his lack of the pastoral instinct. And of course candour like Denney's has its perils, but it has also its exceeding great rewards.'

Now that (let us say it emphatically) is all wrong. Davidson was *incapable* of being moved from the right way by such considerations. He certainly did not think of Robertson Smith's pugnacity or pastoral instinct, and he certainly did not think of himself. He considered only how the truth could best be served. And he served it. He served it better than Robertson Smith or Denney. It is to him that the Old Testament owes the great interest that it has had for our generation; it is to him that we owe our understanding of it.

The book is very readable, and the reading is very profitable. Direct the attention of other editors to this feature of the *Manchester Guardian*. And congratulate the people of Manchester.

We have already had a quotation from *More Trivia* (Constable; 6s. net). It is, you remember, Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith's new book, successor to 'Trivia' the successful. But what is it? It is a treatise on the art of pleasing. It is an encouragement to go through life smiling.

Dr. Lynn Harold Hough has brought together a volume of papers. The first and best is his inaugural address as Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute. Its subject is 'The Approach to Life through History,' and it gives the book its title *Life and History* (Doran). In the second paper there is a good description of the art of interpretation; and a distinction is drawn between interpretation and research. Thereafter the preacher dominates the book, although between 'Making Theology Live' and 'The Genius of John Kelman' comes 'Dante and his Century.' It is all very pleasant.

Dr. Charles E. Erdman, Professor of Practical Theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary, has made a fine attempt to reconcile the pre- and the post-millenarians, by assuring them that the date and manner of the Second Coming are of little consequence: the important thing is the fact of the Return. The title is *The Return of Christ* (Doran; $1 net). The book is introduced by Dr. J. Stuart Holden, who says that the author's standpoint and consequent views are identical with his own.

It is a lucid, reasonable, evangelical book. One word only: Is not the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the Church somewhat left out of account? Dr. Stuart Holden says: 'No permanent peace, no brotherhood of man, ever can be established by force of arms or skill of diplomacy. The coming of Christ himself is the only hope for his people.' Is there not a third alternative?

The purpose of Professor Max L. Margolis in *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society) seems to be to commend to his Jewish readers the critical study of the Old Testament. In any case that is what he does. And he does it with much tact as well as learning.

Dr. Wallace E. Caldwell, Instructor in History in Columbia University, has written a history of peace and war in Greece. The title is *Hellenic Conceptions of Peace* (P. S. King & Son; 5s.). It is a history of ideas, but the ideas are illustrated by the facts. We have the familiar story of the Peloponnesian War, for example, retold, with a new thought in our mind—how it taught the Athenians the evils of war, the blessings of peace. And we have the ideas of the great writers, ideas which they themselves formed, on the events that were happening. Sophocles 'pointed out the evil effects for the state, since war took the best of the young men and left the weaklings. "The well-born and the good Ares loves to snatch, while he who is bold in tongue, fleeing from danger, is free from harm, for Ares careth not for the coward."' Herodotus in one short sentence 'delivered a terrible condemnation of war. "Since in war fathers bury their sons, while in peace sons bury their fathers, no one is so senseless as to choose war in place of peace."' Aristophanes wrote a whole Play about Peace. Think, he said:

> Think of all the thousand pleasures,
> Comrades, which to Peace we owe,
> All the life of ease and comfort
> Which she gave us long ago:
> Figs and olives, vines and myrtles,
> Luscious fruits, preserved and dried,
> Banks of fragrant violets, blowing
> By the crystal fountain-side;
> Scenes for which our hearts are yearning,
> Joys that we have missed so long—
> Comrades, here is Peace returning,
> Greet her back with dance and song.

A clear, simple, orderly introduction to the study of Economics has been written by L. Southerns, M.A., B.Sc., Wh.Sch. It has been published by the Labour Publishing Company (Tavistock Square) under the title of *Physical Economics* (2s. 6d.). It is not a book for the schoolroom. It does not contain facts to be crammed, but principles to be pondered. And it takes some pondering. All the same it is an introduction to Economics, more true, more practical in the end, than all the school-books taken together.

A Bibliography of Religion (mainly Avestan and Vedic) has been prepared by Jamshedji E.

Saklatwalla (Luzac; 4s. net). There are not a few misprints in it. A bad example is:

'Hastings, J. Editor the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 13 vols., Edinburgh 1908–1907. (refer variousarheles on Oriental Religions).'

There are, of course, many omissions, and there are some useless inclusions, such as:

'Guthrie, Thomas. Studies of Character from the Old Testament. (I and II Series.)'

But withal the book deserves the attention of scholars, and the author deserves the hearty thanks of students. Another edition (which is likely to be called for) will correct the errors and supply the most necessary of the omissions. The form in which it is published is attractive.

In *The Fisher-Folk of Buchan*, by Mr. John McGibbon (Marshall Brothers; 4s. 6d. net), we have 'things as they really are in a Scotch fishing town.' The town is Peterhead. Surely the book will be well read there, for there is no disguise, probably not even the change of a name. But it is as kindly as it is true, and no offence will be taken. Here is a scene oft witnessed and worth witnessing often. 'In Jeems Turner's old hall, that is now occupied by the Salvation Army, another meeting of the same free and easy character is in progress. The crowd of men and women who pack themselves into that building is tremendous, and often they will overflow from the hall on to the stairs, glad if they can get a peep inside and hear what is going on. This is also an open meeting for anyone who cares to speak or sing, or pray. The swinging sea-hymns that the fisher-folk are so fond of singing, with the rollicking chorus that every one can join in with, are being sung with all their heart and soul. Such grand old hymns as "Rescue the perishing, care for the dying," or one that has a chorus like "Pull for the shore, sailor, pull for the shore," are caught up and sung over and over again. As the testimonies and singing are open to all, old and young throw themselves into these exercises with so much enthusiasm that there is scarcely time for all to speak who would like to. Orthodox people might say that to their taste it lacked solemnity, but our fisher-folk know when to be free, and when to be solemn, and their reply to any such criticism would be, "Man, it's graund; where the speerit o' the Lord is there is leeberty."'

Mr. David Baron, who is of Jewish race, has written a book on *The Servant of Jehovah* (Morgan & Scott; 5s. net). It is a valuable book. With all the commentaries in existence there is room for it. Mr. Baron holds firmly by the prophetic reference to a single vicarious sufferer and the complete fulfilment in Jesus the Christ. He quotes effectively from the early Jewish commentators, none of whom ever thought of the nation as the Suffering Servant till Rashi came and made that welcome suggestion.

Why God became Man (Sands; 3s. 6d. net) is the title (with apologies to Anselm) which the Rev. Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A., has chosen for a book which is more than an argument for the Incarnation. It is an answer to Job's cry, 'Oh, that I knew where I might find him.' Mr. Walker's answer finally is, 'in the Church.' But he reaches that final answer after an interesting account of the cry itself, its origin, its universality, and then of the answer to it in the Synoptic Gospels, in John, and by the ministration of the Spirit. As the Spirit is given to the Church, it is there and there only that the human cry finds its satisfaction.

To the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students' add now *An English Translation of the So-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (6d.).

The *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* has been edited, with Introduction and Apparatus Criticus, by J. M. Harden, B.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Dublin (S.P.C.K.; 10s. net).

In the Introduction Dr. Harden tells the story of this Psalter, fully and lucidly. A text of the Hebrew Psalter, with the title *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, was edited by P. A. de Lagarde in 1874, but it is now very scarce. Four editions besides Lagarde's appeared in the nineteenth century, one of them edited by Nestle of Tübingen. Dr. Harden has a poor opinion of this edition; he calls it a piece of patchwork. But all Nestle's work was of the finest scholarship. His Psalter was, like his Greek New Testament, a 'resultant' edition.

Dr. Harden has formed his own text after

consulting previous editions and collecting available manuscripts. He gives a list of the manuscripts collated. He says: 'The present is the first edition of the Hebrew Psalter to the text of which the evidence of any of the British manuscripts has contributed. Doubtless in it there will be found mistakes, due not only to errors of judgment, but also to those inaccuracies which seem almost inevitable when so many variants have to be dealt with and chronicled. The evidence, however, on which the text is based is before the reader in the notes. This at least will, it is hoped, be some contribution to the study of the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*.'

Mr. Philip Whitwell Wilson has been in the United States of America studying the working of the laws against alcohol. Now 'P. W. W.' is the incarnation of honesty. What he sees he says he sees: what he says may be safely said after him. He has gathered the results of his observations into a book, which may be accepted as entirely reliable. Its title is *After Two Years* (United Kingdom Alliance; 6d.).

In New York he witnessed a 'wet' parade day. The parade 'was attended by about 15,000 persons in a city of six millions, which includes one-third Jews, an immense Irish, German, and Italian population, and, of course, Tammany Hall. The banners were stirring:

'"Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake."

'"God turned water into wine at Cana. The hypocrites turned wine into water in Congress. Where do we get off?"

'"How does it feel to be a criminal? Ask Dad —he knows."

'The Italians carried a picture of the Last Supper by Leonarda da Vinci, and Cromwell as a brewer was invoked. But the occasion was a funeral. It meant that "John Barleycorn," as they call him, was dead.'

He was much struck with the complete absence of drink on the railways. 'It is really no use for bishops, deans, and vicars of the Episcopal Church in England to talk about liquor as if it were a virtue. In all my travel I have never seen a woman insulted and never seen a man the worse for drink.'

A Communion Meditation.

By the Reverend Arthur J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

'This is the day of the Lord's own contriving. Let us be glad and rejoice in it. O Lord, save us, we pray. O Lord, prosper us, we pray.'—Ps $118^{24.25}$.

This is a day of the Lord's own contriving, which an infinitude of Divine love and thoughtfulness and grace has alone made possible. And therefore, in the first place, now that this bend in the road has brought us within sight of Calvary, let us stand still awhile and look, until we grasp and feel again the wonder and amazement of the facts that meet us here.

Mrs. Meynell has a little poem, which Ruskin, in a reckless burst of too exuberant enthusiasm, once termed the finest thing in modern poetry, in which she stands and, dallying with an ordinary daisy in her hand, peers, as through a window, far out into mysteries inscrutable to us; muses and dreams of all that lies behind that common weed, all that went to the making of it, all that had to be in order that it might exist—stands, all at once dwarfed, abashed, humbled, in a world suddenly grown awesome.

> O daisy mine, what will it be to look
> From God's side even of such a simple thing!

Was that the mood of this old singer of the long ago? Perhaps he had come up to the Temple as so often before, by the well-known road that he had traversed scores of times, nodding to the usual faces on the way; and, standing in the accustomed place, had seen and heard the daily service move on through its customary stately ritual, perhaps dully enough, with a mind atrophied by long familiarity; perhaps really accepting the gifts offered—God's strange affection for us, God's eager forgiveness, God's stubborn faith in those who have failed Him so often and so signally, God's queer belief that even yet things can be

righted and the twisted life made straight—accepting, but with little wonderment.

It was all so usual; it had all so often been experienced before, was taken as a thing of course. And suddenly the clouds were blown aside; and, with a heart stilled and awed and almost frightened, he saw things somewhat from God's side of them, all that had gone to the making of these gifts which he had been accepting so unthinkingly, stood there holding them in his hand, dazed and confused, thinking them out. This is a day which God alone could have contrived; and only Divine grace and loving-kindness and self-sacrifice have made it possible for me.

And is not that the mood that befits us here? At Christ's Table we do feel it somewhat, do we not?—do have a hushed sense that we are face to face with the Central things; our spirits steal on tiptoe; our noisy natures sink their loud rude voices, because God is quite close.

Yet, even here, it is so easy to turn in without much emotion or surprise; to accept even Jesus Christ as only what is due to us; to thrust out a careless hand and take God's best without excitement as no very great affair. 'Of course,' said Heine, 'God will forgive me; that's what He is for.' And yet think it out, see it from God's side, and how staggering it is! Think out anything, indeed, and long before we reach an end our minds sink tired and fluttering helpless pinions into huge yawning depths and chasms past our fathoming. Almost the one authentic poet of our day stands looking at a common dog-rose coming into bloom, and sees with amazement that the roots of that ordinary wayside bush run back almost to the beginnings of dim Time.

> Very old are the woods;
> And the buds that break
> Out of the briar's boughs,
> When March winds wake,
> So old with their beauty are—
> Oh, no man knows
> Through what wild centuries
> Roves back the rose.

All that had to be before that innocent blossom, plucked by some child, who quickly tired of it and threw it away with a careless hand, could lie there withering in the hot dust.

Or we are whirled through the country, watch the smoke wreaths curling up lazily from sleepy homesteads in the sheltered hollows. And there are bairns upon their way to school, and women flitting to and fro about the doors, and men at work among the fields; and it is all so peaceful, so idyllic, drowsing there in the hot sun. And yet to make that cosy nook what unthinkable cataclysms and upheavals had to be; when the sea broke in, overwhelming all things, and for long æons rolled and tossed and surged above them here; when the mountains were heaved up with confusion and tumult, when the gliding glaciers slowly, age after age, ground down the ragged peaks to this soft billowy upland, when the kindly soil was fashioned by wild hurricane and bitter frost and howling tempest out of the hard rocks—all that was necessary that these quiet fields might lie so soft and green and golden in the low morning sunlight.

And here are we, a company of needy folk gathering in hopefully about Christ's Table, sure that we shall be uplifted, granted every grace and power we can require. And yet, could we take these simple symbols into our hands, and realize all that went to the making of them; could we see from God's side of them, how staggering, how stupendous it would be.

The whole New Testament is just an effort to do that—to show us these things from God's side. They know that they are failing; they are conscious that it breaks through language, won't describe, eludes them, that, as Luther says, they are using half words and quarter words like a baby; they stammer, they stutter, they feel great tides and currents seize them and sweep them off their feet and far out into vast deeps, where they can but throw up their hands and sink. And yet they do bring home to us something of the wonder of it all; do make us see it somewhat from God's side. Look! they cry, look! and, following their pointing finger, can't you see that stolid knot of soldiery haughtily pushing back that jeering, hooting crowd; and that tired Figure in the midst, how worn, how broken in body from the horrors of the iron-tipped Roman lash? See, they have laid the Cross upon the ground, have thrown Him down upon it. Ah! the nails run like fire through the sensitive flesh! See! they have lifted Cross and Victim and dunted it roughly into the socket. 'It is excruciating,' men cry in an agony, their faces all contorted, their hands clenched, maddened by what is really unbearable. 'It is excruciating!' And excruciating means the pains of crucifixion. And the slow sun sets, and the long day wanes, and the small group

of weeping women slip back to the city, and by and by the enemies, turning for one last bitter and exultant gibe, move off, chuckling at the poor imposture that they have stamped out; and, last of all, the troops tramp back to barracks, and the stars steal out, and look down coldly upon the dishonoured dead, hanging there on a convict's gibbet. And all that had to be before your heart could hear Christ say to you to-day, 'This is My body, everything I have, and it's all for you.'

Look! they cry, and, following their finger, can't you see, past the Cross, far out into the eternities —see God as He really is? How different from what we had conceived Him! With His face grey with an agony that He has borne from all eternity. So have we hurt Him by these sins of ours which worry us scarcely at all; so intolerable to Him is this outrage of evil we have introduced into His Universe. And yet, although we have so wounded Him, He loves us, clings to us, cannot give us up. Always He has been planning how to help us; always He has been thinking how to save us from ourselves; counting no cost, reckoning up no sacrifice, heedless what it means to Him if only we be plucked back from self-destruction. And all that lies behind that crumb of ordinary bread; all that is in it, could we see it from God's side of things. Take it, man, take it freely; it is meant expressly for you. But do not your hands tremble? For, to make that possible, Christ had to die, and God's heart had to break.

> I saw this people as a field of flowers,
> Each grown at such a price,
> The sum of unimaginable powers
> Did no more than suffice.
> A thousand central daisies, they,
> A thousand of the one;
> For each the entire monopoly of day
> For each the whole of the devoted sun.

Free though it be to you, the cost of that was all God's all. The wonder and amazement of the facts, seen from God's side of them!

And, then, our attitude in view of them. As to that there can be no dubiety whatever. This is a day of God's own contriving, which only Divine grace made possible. We must be glad and rejoice in it. What else is even thinkable if we really believe this, accept this, credit that Christ means what He says.

Austerely beautiful although it be, the characteristic note of our Scottish Communion rings flat in my ears, and out of harmony with the true spirit of the day. This is no time for grave and sombre melodies, but for happy faces and for happy hearts dazed and bewildered by the immensity of their own good fortune. 'Dear me, Dr. Duncan,' they said, for the old Hebrew Professor was striding along Princes Street in Edinburgh, his face aglow and shining, smiling to himself, cracking his fingers as he walked, 'you surely have great news to-day.' 'News!' he made answer. 'News! Wonderful news—the best of news! The blood of Jesus Christ still cleanseth from all sin.' So would we feel if we really believed this; if we were not doubting, not fearing, not spinning limiting conditions whereby we may be excluded, not wondering can it be really true, nor anything except accepting it. Our Lord tells us that the most speaking picture of a genuine Christian is a child, and the characteristic of a normal child is happiness. It can't keep still, must sing and dance for the sheer joy of life. And in the Testament there is a sound of singing almost everywhere. They are the gladdest and the gayest people in the world. And little wonder! Imagine what it must have been to be immured in an appalling German prison camp. Not a doubt some of them were admirably run, but there were instances that pass description. Think what it must have meant to be penned into one of these; to have never a kindly word or human touch, to be beaten and bullied, to be starved and miserable, to have to drag oneself, though desperately ill, to one's excessive toil, to have the very women spit at you: to see the populace, as happened in one dreadful case, when virulent disease broke out, standing at a safe distance screaming with laughter, as, tottering unsteadily, one dragged one's dead companions to the burial-place, and made shift with shaking limbs to scoop a shallow grave for them: to be in the power of hatred, and unable to escape from it; and this for weeks and months and years. And then to land in England, suddenly to find that nightmare gone, with kindly faces everywhere, and compassionate eyes, and ready, helping hands, eagerly leaping out to one's assistance; to be in an atmosphere of love and pride in one, and endless sympathy. That is the difference the faith made. People had thought that the Divine powers were hostile to us, must be hostile, because we have callously broken their laws. They tried desperately to forget; but,

when they remembered, they crouched and cringed and shivered, expecting that any moment Divine wrath might leap out and blast them. And at the Cross they saw that God's heart is entirely with us; that He has not one thought towards us that is not kindly and generous and unselfish. And with that the sun broke out, and winter vanished from the earth, and of a sudden spring with its glory and its song and its rejoicing was in these folk's hearts. And we must take that in, and credit it as true for us—that God has never a thought toward us that is not merciful and gracious and very pitiful. Chalmers was no great success as a visitor among his congregation. Gladstone tells us how he once went a round with him, and how the great soul entered each new house, sat smiling, but without a word, for he had no small change of conversation, rose up, and went his way, with almost nothing said. Yet on occasion he could be effective enough. There was a melancholious soul who could not be got to believe that God could really love her, had in very deed forgiven her. And one day he burst in on her. 'Madam,' he said, 'I've come to tell you God has no ill-will at you,' and was gone. God has no ill-will at us! He might well have! Remember how we have neglected Him, forgotten Him, wounded Him, been impudent and insolent day after day. I tell you if you had treated me as I have treated God I would hate you, loathe the thought of you, be filled with an ungovernable rage the moment you came into sight. 'If I were God,' cried Luther hotly, 'I would kick this wretched world to pieces.' But God is incapable of harbouring grudges, of ill-humour and temper and peevishness; forgets, blots it all out; begins again as hopefully and patiently as ever; loves on. Even Paul can't understand that in the very least, is taken aback and staggered. It seems so unreasonable, so impossible! Why should He, and how can He? If we had been kind of half decent—but to us—to us! Yet though he doesn't understand it, he believes it, accepts it, walks in the warm sunshine of it. And so must we. This is a day that only God could have contrived for us; let us be glad and rejoice in it. Dante tells us that in his grim journeyings he came upon some in an evil plight, and asked them why this had befallen them. Once, they explained, we were sad and gloomy and sour-humoured in God's beautiful earth. And while life holds much of tragedy for some of us, and there are many things that hurt and stab these hearts of ours till some of us must bite our lips to keep from crying out in pain, still at Christ's Table to be grave of face and unexcited can only mean that we have not grasped and taken in all that this means, the wonder and amazement of it—from God's side of it, and from ours. When the West Indian slaves were liberated, they gathered on the momentous night into their churches and knelt there in prayer. But when the long-expected hour had at last actually struck, they leapt up to their feet, singing, rejoicing, and embracing one another, laughing in sheer happiness although the tears were running down their cheeks. Free! Free! Free! In such mood surely should we gather at Christ's Table, so awed, yet so exultant and so very happy. For we too, thank God, are free! This is a great day of God's own contriving for us; let us rejoice and be glad in it.

The amazement of the facts, our attitude in view of them, and, lastly, a practical use of them. For all this, that cost so much, must not be allowed to evaporate in a mere gush of feeling and emotion, like a Highland burn roaring in spate, and yet to-morrow shrunk again to the usual thin trickle whimpering, half-choked, among the bare, bleached stones. It must be condensed to action, into real and purposeful amendment of our characters and lives. Scholars tell us that this Psalm was probably a shout of thanksgiving for some great victory, for the happy conclusion of a war in which things had for long looked ominous and hopeless. They were flocking up into the Temple to give thanks to God, like ourselves upon Armistice Day, when, for a few hours, we were really a religious people, with a vivid almost overpowering sense of God; when in many places, even in the heart of mighty cities, one had only, without announcement, to open a church and ring a bell, and in a few minutes it was packed from floor to ceiling with folk eager to bring their offering of thanksgiving. So perhaps it was here. And yet you notice this man's prayer: 'O Lord, save us, we pray; O Lord, prosper us, we pray.' But were they not there just precisely because God had saved them, and had prospered them in ways unbelievable, and yet gloriously true! Did this man feel that face to face with this colossal proof and instance of the lengths to which God's grace can go, it were sheer folly not to seize on it for all their other needs—for all the national

sores, and all his personal weaknesses? O Lord, who can save so amazingly—save us from this, and this, and this, that still besets and threatens us: O Lord, who can bring success where it looked impossible—prosper us here, and here, and here, where we have failed, and lost heart, and ceased even to try. There is a moving scripture in which God, passing before Moses, proclaims Himself as the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin. And we read how Moses hearing this made haste and, seizing on that proclamation, applied it instantly to his own wants and needs. If Thou art merciful and gracious, since Thou forgivest iniquity and sin, pardon our iniquity, forgive our sin.

So Paul, too, standing at the Cross, feels in his heart that this finally settles it, that if God has gone this length for us there is nothing that He will not grant us. If He has given us His Son, will He not freely give us anything and everything that we can need? Well, here are we, face to face with this bewildering proof of what God means when He says that He loves us, of the lengths to which He goes, of the bewilderments He does, let us make haste, and before we pass into the world and it all fades away, grows dim and far off, and an unreal, shadowy rumour blown vaguely to and fro about the world, let us apply it to our own case—this overwhelming grace, this so illimitable love, this immeasurable power to help—to our temper, our ill-humours, our touchiness, our engrained selfishness, to our besetting sins, to the temptations that have so often broken us that, daunted, we make small show of resistance now, slink tamely to heel, obedient to their first truculent whistle. Save us, O Thou whose name is Saviour, and who hast wonderfully and most surely earned Thy title, save us from this, and this, and this; and prosper us in our endeavours to be done with our too fatally familiar self; to grow into Christ's mind and heart and characteristic ways, till, naturally and instinctively, we think His thoughts, and will His will, and live after His fashion. When the Lord Christ passed through a village everybody felt that here was a God-given and enormous opportunity that might not come again, and laid hold on it with both hands; clutched at Christ's power, applied it to their individual weaknesses, translated it into the terms of their own personal wants. The blind cried give me sight; the deaf pled make me hear; the impotent besought Him for strength to be done with helpless, weary lying—to stand up, to live a full, whole, interesting life, the life of a real man. And this is a day that God Himself has contrived for us, and we must make haste to appropriate it, use it, think it out, apply it to our individual and personal case. No doubt we are here to give Him thanks for an amazing act of condescension, for a fulness of grace that staggers us, and takes away the breath, and leaves one dazed and stunned, if we see it at all from God's side. But then, when a wise Psalmist felt like that, and came up to the Temple of set purpose to make some return to God for His bewildering goodness, thinking things out, he came to the conclusion that the truest gratitude is to be willing to accept still more. 'What shall I give to God for all His benefits?—I shall take,' he said. And Pope—found, of all men, among the prophets—tells us bluntly he was right. 'For God is paid, when man receives'; the way to thank Him is to take yet more, and more, and more.

The wonder and amazement of the facts! our attitude in view of them; a practical use of them! And so, let us sit down with the Master at His Table.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Theology and Religion.

The firm of Hinrichs in Leipzig is issuing this year a new series of a monthly journal, known for more than thirty years as the *Kartell-Zeitung*. Its new title is *Theologische Blätter*, and its editor is Dr. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, New Testament Professor in Giessen. A specimen copy, received from the publishers, makes a favourable impression, alike for the varied interest of its contents and the quality of its articles. Amongst the subjects treated at length are 'The History of the Synoptic Tra-

dition,' and 'Prolegomena to the Psychology of Religion.' There is also a résumé of recent works on 'New Testament Criticism,' in which satisfaction is expressed that in England and America, as well as in Germany, attempts are being made to bring to the knowledge of scholars, independently of their nationality, the work that was done during the war in the various departments of biblical and theological study.

The editor writes on 'Theology and Religion,' and distinguishes them as particular examples of the two categories 'Science' and 'Life.' Theology is not religion, but it is the science of religion. Therefore the distinction must not be represented as opposition. 'In the sermons, personal confessions, and above all in the prayers of great theologians, there is often revealed a quite naïve religious experience, although in the writings by which they are known to us the speculative element predominates.' Nevertheless, the history of religion introduces us to creative personalities who have been critics of theology, as, *e.g.* mystics, prophets, missionaries, and reformers. The religion of such men is their life, but they do not feel that it is necessary to harmonize their religious experience with the teachings of science.

To-day there are those who profess to renounce theology from religious motives, and history does indeed show that great religious revolutions have set aside the theology of the schools and have directed attention to new problems. In this way new material has been supplied to the systematic theologian; it then becomes his duty, so far as is possible, to assimilate it, remembering that he is called, as a faithful steward, to trade with the particular talent entrusted to him. Moreover, not all who pose as non-theologians are really without a theology. Group theology often differs from University theology rather in degree than in kind.

Theology should never be represented as *the* way to religion, but those who despise it should remember that it is *a* way to religion, and can render valuable help to the religious inquirer. Yet the systematic theologian is always a man of his own time; he must study the religious experience of his contemporaries, as the scientist must investigate life in its present-day manifestations; thus he will make his own contribution to the solution of the religious problems of his age. To do this effectively he must himself be a religious man. It may be said, however, that a scholar to whom religion is an illusion may undertake and successfully carry out investigations yielding results which are of great service to theology. 'But just as one who lacks the artistic temperament can never understand a great artist, though he may have written historic treatises on art, so it is impossible for an irreligious man to fathom the depths of religion.' Rightly to investigate the Christian religion a theologian must be a true Christian. In conclusion, Dr. Schmidt insists that exegesis should be at once edifying and scientific, and that piety is an essential element in the equipment of the Christian theologian, whether he is dealing with history or with dogma.

The attention of students of the Synoptic Gospels may be called to a recent publication of the J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, entitled *Pneuma Hagion: Der Ursprung des Geistbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik*, von Hans Leisegang (Leipzig; 9s.). It is No. 4 of the publications of the Institute for research into the comparative history of religion in the University of Leipzig. Herr Leisegang published in 1919 (Berlin: Teubner) Part I. of a comprehensive work on *The Holy Spirit*. The difficulties of publication at the present time have prevented the issue of Part II. in its entirety. The main results of his investigations have, therefore, been condensed into the present volume. In the preface Herr Leisegang states that it is far from his intention to relegate to the background the Jewish and other Oriental influences that have affected the Synoptic tradition by a one-sided emphasis on the Greek contribution to it. The question he endeavours to answer is not: What words, ideas, and representations in the Gospels can ultimately be traced either to a Greek or to a Semitic origin? The questions he asks are rather these: What would a Greek understand by those words, ideas, and representations? What did he actually take them to mean? What did he make of the Synoptic tradition? What did he read into it? Herr Leisegang says that his constant aim has been to penetrate through the dead letter to the spirit which animated the tradition. The conception of the Spirit as it finds expression in the Synoptic Gospels is examined in great detail under six headings. Material is furnished which deserves the consideration of experts who, whether they

accept all the author's conclusions or not, will appreciate his extensive researches.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College, Birmingham.

The New Strasbourg.

STRASBOURG has had a change of masters, and its University has been affected by the change. The reorganized seat of learning appears to be making a strong effort to achieve for itself a 'place in the sun,' and it seems to us that it is in a very fair way to do so. An extraordinary literary and scholarly activity is in progress. The mere extent of the published programme is amazing. Fine fruits have been yielded already, and more are in prospect. Mere quantity, of course, goes for little, but if we may judge by the samples we have received, the quality delights no less than the quantity surprises. We have one from what in this country would be known as the Faculty of Arts, and one from the Protestant Faculty of Theology.

I.

The former is a collection of Essays on Medieval Philosophy by Étienne Gilson, Professor of the History of Philosophy.[1] In the phrase 'medieval philosophy' each word constitutes a problem. When exactly did the Middle Ages end? and had that period a philosophy in anything like the modern sense at all? To the former no easy answer can be given. There is no year which can be taken as a watershed between medieval and modern times. History knows little of sharp distinctions. To-day, even if it be a day of revolution, still bears some features of yesterday, its parent. Most true is that of the history of thought. And Gilson is right in finding that while medievalism extends its grasp as far as Descartes—please note, *Descartes*, not *Cartesianism*—Modernism, on the other hand, has its roots far back in the introduction to Europe of the Sciences by the Arabs. Can we speak of the *philosophy* of the Middle Ages? Not quite in the modern sense. But there is one great figure whose 'travail of thought' made philosophy possible and led towards it, and that was Thomas Aquinas. Round Aquinas and Descartes, therefore, the essays centre. The exposition is clear and thought-provoking; the style is limpid, the whole is most readable. Whether Gilson is discussing the theory of 'double truth,' or Cartesian innate ideas, or the curious controversy of Hervey and Descartes on the circulation of the blood, or Campanella's interesting view of Analogy, he carries one along both by weight of scholarship and lightness of literary touch. It is entertaining to find that while Descartes had the true scientific spirit which prompts a search for 'real causes' in explaining a phenomenon, he lacked the preliminary scientific caution which makes sure that there is a phenomenon to be explained. In consequence he sometimes gave a most satisfying explanation of natural happenings that did not happen at all.

[1] *Études de Philosophie Médiévale*, pp. 292. Strasbourg, 1921; Eng. agent, Mr. Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press.

II.

The other is a study of the spiritual development of Luther.[2] Strohl's study in certain respects confirms Gilson's. Both would have us learn to lay far less stress than we are wont upon the catastrophic significance of the period of the Reformation. Not the 16th but the 18th century marks a new age in the history of European thought, as, indeed, Troeltsch teaches. The Reformation was a very important phenomenon, no doubt, from various points of view, but it does not mark so decisive a breach with the past in the history of the human spirit as we have sometimes held. The Middle Ages, as both Gilson and Strohl show, were busied with one great problem all through: to vindicate a place for human reason as over against the authority of Dogma. The emergence of Lutheranism was not a 'catastrophe' but a 'denouement.' So, too, in Luther's own spiritual history. It has been too often explained as a series of 'catastrophes.' We have to think rather of gradual developments. Events such as the famous thunderstorm, or the reflexions suggested in Rome as he watched the Santa Scala, have been very much exaggerated and given a picturesque importance which they do not deserve. At the best they gave a little added impulse to a movement already in progress in his spirit. That the Santa Scala had any real influence at all is very doubtful.

[2] *L'Évolution Religieuse de Luther, jusqu'en 1515*, Henri Strohl, pp. 174. Strasbourg et Paris, 1922.

It is difficult to avoid the appearance of fulsomeness in attempting to estimate this penetrating and illuminating study of Luther. Were it only for the careful and discriminating discussion of recent literature, both Catholic and Protestant, the book would be indispensable to students. Recent literature, be it said, is all that a student needs, and the quantity of it is very great. The War interfered with our knowledge of a good deal of it. The main problems of Luther's earlier years are such as: Why did he become a monk? what was the nature of the bitter conflict of soul which distressed him, until about 1515 he found peace? how did he attain peace? and what precisely is signified by his 'discovery of the gospel'? These questions are put and answered in a way that is convincing. A further study of Luther is promised. We look forward to it with expectation and impatience.

'What ails ministers nowadays at the Song of Solomon? They never mention it, even at the Lord's Table.' Such was the query of a venerable elder who firmly believed that the column-headings in our A.V.—'The mutual love of Christ and His Church,' etc.—were part of the inspired text. Well, what about the Song? The allegorical view, first questioned by Herder, has gone. The view that it is a drama of sorts has gone too. Is it, as Haupt holds, a mere collection of love-ditties? No, says Thilo, it is not a mere anthology. The pearls are not separate, they are on a string. The whole is a unity and subserves a great ethical purpose which justifies its retention in the Canon.[1] According to Thilo the Song traces the development of love from the first awaking of 'soft desire' to wedded bliss. It marks an epoch in the history of morality and social progress, as teaching thus artistically a true conception of woman as a person not a chattel, and pointing the way to monogamy. This little work has a value out of all proportion to its size. The translation is striking and excellent. A few passages, such as that about the mysterious 'chariots of Amminadab,' are frankly given up as beyond skill to divine the sense.

If there is to be canonization at all, Jeanne D'Arc deserved it more than some of the semi-mythical and thaumaturgic personages who have the prefix 'Saint' in the calendars of the Eastern and Western Churches. The story of one whose faith and purity of soul guarded her as with a wall of fire amid a rough soldiery in camps and bivouacs cannot be told too often, and as a strictly historical record it is well told by Father L. H. Petitot, O.P.[2]

The author does not attempt any theory of the psychical problems of the 'prophetic' preparation of the stage on which the 'panoplied maid' appeared, or of the 'voices' which directed her. Nor does he mention the curious tale of a lady whom some took to be Jeanne years after the execution. When he hazards the opinion that, but for Jeanne, France might have been Protestant, he will not expect us to share his enthusiasm, but, frankly, we doubt very much the probability of this.

We reverence Jeanne so much that it hurts to find her deathless story set forth in such poor outward form, on bad paper, with narrow margins, and so many misprints.

Italian translations of the Scriptures have been few. There have been only two versions of the whole. That of Diodati was good in its day; that of Martini was always mediocre; both need amendment. But a new translation is being published. One scholar is translating and annotating and writing introductions to the entire Scriptures, including the Apocrypha. It is Professor Giovanni Luzzi. He has undertaken a big task, but to judge by his *Genesi con una Introduzione Generale al Pentateuco* (pp. 149, Firenze) he is doing it right well. He places before the '*lettore di media coltore*' in simple form the generally accepted view of modern scholars as to the composition of the Pentateuch, and indicates in the margin what parts are from *J*, *E*, *P*, or *JE*. The notes are to the point. The book is beautifully illustrated with maps and pictures of antiquities which we note are reproduced from the publications of the Oxford University Press. We wish the Professor all success in his great enterprise. The Publishers appeal to the Italian public, 'If you have a library, add to it the Bible; if you can have only one book, let it be the Bible.' Splendid!

W. D. Niven.

Aberdeen.

[1] *Das Hohelied neu übersetzt u. ästetisch-sittlich erklärt*, Lic. Dr. Martin Thilo, pp. 48. Bonn, 1921.

[2] *Sainte Jeanne D'Arc*, pp. 504. Paris, 1921.

Wobbermin.[1]

This solid and interesting work forms the second volume of Wobbermin's 'Systematic Theology,' the first having appeared in 1913. Like its predecessor, it is full of knowledge, fairness, and good sense, and may well rank as a standard book of reference about the recent discussions of its subject. Schleiermacher is throughout the point of departure; Wobbermin aspires, not improperly, to continue and develop the master's work. We again hear much of the religio-psychological method as the only right one; but by this, let us note, is not meant the method of the empirical psychology of religion, but a sustained attempt to elicit the specifically religious element in experience, interpreted in the light of one's own religious life, and especially to get at the inner meaning of religious conviction and the crucial interest of the religious man in the *truth* of his beliefs. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that a purely historical comparison of the faiths of mankind gives us no real help in fixing what in them is strictly religious, and not rather to be put down to the account of magic and mythology. To the question, *e.g.*, Is animism a religion? it affords no reply.

From a book of such compass I can only select a few matters of more than usual significance. The author brings out freshly a point on which much has lately been written, viz. that in Schleiermacher 'feeling' denotes a mode of apprehension, and is no mere subjective state of mind. God, the Infinite, is for it an immediate object, not simply the term of a causal inference. Its nature is conceived as the opposite of rational reflexion *about* feeling. Wobbermin holds that to define religion as the feeling of utter dependence means that in the last resort our definition of religion need not include the word 'God,' and that thus we escape from a circle. But do we want to escape? I cannot myself see that Wobbermin's repeated assertion that not 'God' but 'a higher world' is the true object of the religious relation comes to very much, more especially if Luther is right in saying, in famous words, that 'a God means what one looks to for all good and makes a refuge in all trouble.' This is wide enough to cover all genuine religions; and if Buddhism is properly a religion, as Wobbermin contends, it will somehow cover it also. Religion and God imply each other, and the circle is inescapable because religious experience has to be assumed. Still, in spite of previous workers, there is something that is original and much that is wholly satisfying in this new discussion of Schleiermacher's basal ideas. It is good to have it proved that the great pioneer is not a 'subjectivistic' thinker, as many of us have been wont to say, largely by his own fault. He did not really isolate feeling; and in feeling, or immediate self-consciousness, God for him is *given*, and need not be searched for as the ground of this or that.

It is, however, necessary to build higher on Schleiermacher's foundations, and in proceeding to this Wobbermin enters on a careful study of Mysticism. He rejects Heiler's view that Mysticism involves the radical negation alike of the Ego and the world; not even in Eckhart is there anything of that kind. What Christian mystics at all events have aimed at is the closest possible relation of unity between the soul and God. The unity is at the same time a relation. Buddhism holds a unique place in the history of religions, for the question can quite fairly be put whether it is a religion at all. Wobbermin decides in its favour, on the ground largely that Nirvana is essentially positive in content, though this, of course, has been denied. I am not sure that Wobbermin's argument on the point takes account sufficiently of the fact that even although a state were conceived as purely negative—as Nirvana probably was—yet it could not be *described* at all except at the cost of importing certain positive elements into the description. He is right, however, in urging that what led Buddhism into inextricable difficulties was the conflict within it of belief in a higher world with a thoroughly sceptical metaphysic.

Eventually, after refuting various efforts to deny the transcendent reference of piety, Wobbermin defines religion in these terms: 'The essence of religion consists in the attitude and relation of man to a Higher World—a world in which he believes, whose reality he divines in his belief, and on which he feels himself dependent.' The feeling of dependence is the deepest thing, but to it Wobbermin further attaches the feeling of 'protectedness' and the feeling of 'longing.' These

[1] *Das Wesen der Religion.* By Georg Wobbermin, Dr. phil. et theol., Professor in Heidelberg. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921. Pp. viii, 499. Price 11s. 6d. (paper covers); 15s. 6d. (bound).

two last items represent an advance, he holds, on Schleiermacher. From the first flows the sense of obligation, from the second the impulse after blessedness. Otto is censured for abstracting wholly from morality in his wish to reach the purely religious fact; for, says Wobbermin convincingly, religion itself contains the sense of being bound to an unseen power, as is proved by the existence of prayer and sacrifice.

We cannot pause over the author's new proposals for the classification of religions. In this connexion he returns to the subject of Mysticism, pleading that as an independent form it is to be carefully distinguished from the mystical element found in every religion, and that it is not necessarily pantheistic. Ritschl's handling of the problem is now seen to have been lop-sided. In the *Bhagavad-gita* personalism and pantheistic mysticism move side by side unharmonized. While not pantheistic in fibre, Mysticism does impair the feeling of dependence and is in tendency hostile to the idea of mediation. All this is richly illustrated from the sacred books of India. In sum, Buddhism, Mysticism, and Pantheism may be described as special forms of the contemplative religion of redemption.

Wobbermin, then, enters on the problem of the truth of religion, studied in the light of its essence. Here the supreme thing is to discover and clarify the evidences of validity to be found in religion itself. All hangs on the question whether the 'higher world,' with which the believer feels himself to be in relation, is real or illusory. In an important passage it is laid down that any scientific proof of the being of God can be only indirect: objections can be refuted, it can be shown that explanations of faith which assume its emptiness and untruth are themselves unsound; and attention can be drawn to various aspects of science, morality, and art which only become intelligible if the religious hypothesis be accepted. Lang and Schmidt's theory of a primitive monotheism is rightly bowed out, on the ground that Christian influence had already touched the supposed data: this is a masterly section. Religion and magic, originally mixed up, are distinguished for familiar reasons. Leuba's attempt to discredit religion by a *petitio principii* is dealt with faithfully, though the counter-argument is rather loose. Among the best passages in this part of the work are scrutinies of Feuerbach's classic statement of illusionism, Lubbock's view that there are tribes wholly devoid of religious practice, Natorp's effort to state religion solely in humanitarian terms, and Vaihinger's able but unavailing contention that Kant can be quoted for the *Als-ob* philosophy. In concluding chapters it is urged that recent natural science is markedly teleological in tendency, and that religion as such is neither friendly to civilization nor hostile, but critical. The link which binds science and morality to religion is humility in presence of that which is infinite and commanding, be it the system of nature or the sublime fact of duty.

It may be suggested to Wobbermin and a host of present-day writers to consider whether the habit of describing religion as essentially 'irrational' has not been carried too far. No one would deny that the term contains some truth; faith is supra-logical, in the sense that there is always more in religious experience than can be turned into transparent theory. But after all there is a wider and larger sense of reason for which religion is no more irrational than morality is. Hedonism regards the categorical imperative of duty as irrational, and to this there is no reply, if we start with a hedonistic view of ethical reason. Besides, why call that 'irrational' which alone imparts *meaning*, in the ultimate sense, to human life and history. The confusions of the fashionable terminology come out with startling clearness in the following sentence: 'The core of religion, though for the individual it invariably signifies a wholly irrational fact of life, must from the supreme point of view rank as in harmony with reason' (p. 457).

The work as a whole is one of great value, and one feels it is bound to wear well. It represents the kind of middle position, between stiff conservatism and revolutionary caprice, to which a judicious mind, fully aware of the long previous discussions, may to-day come. We look forward with anticipation to the next volume, in which the author will attack the great problem of the Essence of Christianity.

H. R. Mackintosh.

New College, Edinburgh.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Visit to a Picture House.

'That ye may be sincere.'—Ph 1^{10}.

Are you fond of the Picture House? Rather, you say. You just love to settle down in the cosy chair in the dark, and forget all about maths. and Latin verbs, and get carried far away to the ends of the earth, among Red Indians and Mexicans, and galloping horses, and men with rifles cracking, and terribly exciting things, till all at once the lights go up and you waken up to be yourself again. Well, there's a splendid picture house that is always open; and there's no price to pay; not even half-price. You can go in when you like, and sit as long as you care, and the programme doesn't ever begin over again, runs on and on, and always new. Would you care to come? Well! what's the name of the picture house that you like best. This one is called the Dictionary. Ach! you say; I thought it was a real one. And so it is. It is just full of splendid pictures for those with eyes to see. Take that word 'astonished.' Shut your eyes, and think out what it means, until you see it all. There's a knot of travellers in a wild country, no shelter anywhere, and look how black the sky has grown! and what a pelt of rain! Look at it coming down in bucketfuls. You see one of them has run under that tree, it's rather drier there. But ah! did you see that?—that blinding flash of lightning. Why, it has struck the tree, and the man too. To be astonished is to be thunder-struck.

Quite a good film, isn't it?

Or turn the pages; here's a word you often use —'companion.' And here's the new film beginning to run. This time it's a barracks, and there are soldiers everywhere, rough fellows, old and scarred, that have been through many a scrap and many an adventure. Among them is a young lad newly joined, a raw recruit, looking a bit out of it and far from home, and shy. But, you see that? There's a decent fellow who has made up to him, and is showing him the ropes, what to do, and not to do; and you see he is taking out a hunk of bread and is halving it with the youngster. That's what a companion means, one who shares his bread with you. And that's the picture there.

Or do you know the word 'trivial.' It means petty, or little, or small. Look, here's a good film coming! There's a woman going marketing; how she bustles along; she's in a desperate hurry, wants to get back to her baby and her washing and her house. You see she has reached the cross-roads where three streets meet; she's crossing; she has met another woman coming up one of the other roads; she stands still, both of them do. They've begun to talk; they put down their baskets; they stand a long, long time with their heads and tongues going hard. Why, here's a third one coming up the third road, and she stops too, and she speaks just as much as the others: nod, nod, nod, go the three heads; chatter, chatter, chatter, go the three tongues; and it's all about nothing. Trivial means chatter about nothing at the cross-roads.

It's a good picture house, and here is a good picture! You know that word 'sincere.' It means honest, or thorough, or without sham and pretence. But first of all it meant 'without wax,' *sine cera* in the Latin. And what is the picture there? I think this is a funny one. There's a man eating honey, and he likes it, that's plain. But what's wrong? His face is all twisted; he's got hold of something horrid; he's calling for water to put away the taste. Some honey has a wax that is very bitter, and if you come upon a bit of that it's nasty. And 'sincere' is without wax, is honey through and through. So a sincere boy means one who is honest altogether, who is all the real thing, who has no lumps of horridness in him, now and then, and here and there; no untruths at times, no bad tempers, no ill humours that flame out unexpectedly, no falsehoods to get out of scrapes. My honey is sincere, the old shopman used, perhaps, to say. There is no bitter wax in it. I wonder can your Father make that boast of you? My boy and my girl are sincere, have no nastinesses mingling with the nice things in them.

But others think that is not really the picture here at all. Go to another picture house, and when sincere is put on you won't see that one about the honey but this other one instead. The word sincere means without wax. Both the Greeks and the Romans used a word like that. And

there's a Greek word for sincere that means tested by the sun. And what's the picture there? Long ago folk were very fond of statues; they had them in their churches, they had them in their houses, they had them in their gardens, they had them everywhere. And some people couldn't afford very dear and expensive ones. And so the makers of them had a cheaper kind. They weren't bad. To look at them you would say they were as good every bit as the dearer ones. But these really weren't as good as they looked—were made of a poor stone, with little cracks, and small flaws, and discoloured bits in it. And what they did was to chip out these ugly pieces of the stone, and then fill up the holes and cracks with wax just the same colour as the marble, and when it was all finished it seemed splendid. People looked at it and said, There's a fine statue! I wish I could buy it! Why, how cheap it is! I can afford it! And they bought it, and were very proud of it. But when they put it in their garden and a hot day came, the sun melted the wax, and the cracks showed.

And sometimes a great statue by a famous sculptor got chipped and broken a little bit. And the owner put wax in it and stood it in a shady corner where the sun never reached it, and no one knew.

But when he died the statue might go to the market to be sold, and somebody would buy it and be proud to have so glorious a statue made by such a famous artist, but when he put it in his garden the sun showed the cracks when the hidden wax melted away. It wasn't genuine, not through and through; it wasn't sincere. And so when people bought a statue they would say, I'll take it if it is sincere, if there's no wax about it.

Well, what about you? You look a nice girl and a straight, clean boy. But I wonder if you really are all that you look. Mother and Father believe in you, but, I wonder, did you go to bed just when you promised them you would, or did you wait up till you had read on to the chapter's end, and kept telling yourself it's all right, the old clock must have gone fast? I wonder were you asleep when Mother went round; or had you been having a pillow fight five seconds before? Perhaps Mother thought—though she said nothing—that you looked a little bit too innocent and sleepy, that your pillow was very crushed and rumply, went away a wee bit sore at heart because her boy could try to deceive her. I wonder if there are no cracks, no wax, no pretence, no sham. I wonder lots of things.

When people write a letter they end up 'Yours sincerely.' That means, This is an honest letter, everything in it is quite true, you can depend on it. If it weren't so there could be no business, for we couldn't trust each other. Remember you are writing a long letter; every day you add another sentence—for it is your life. And every night can you sign it 'Yours sincerely,' and your name? Can you say everything that I have said, and everything that I have done, and all my work, and all my thoughts and all my words to-day have been honest, true, above-board, sincere, with no wax or sham in them?

Have you a Receiving Set?

'Here am I; for thou didst call me.'—1 Sam. 3^8.

Has Dad been telling you about the newest things in wireless—about those queer messages that come without wires and poles? I think it's rather like when you shy a stone into a pool, and the eddies go rippling out and out until they reach the bank all round. And so when people speak, they send out waves into the air, and the wise men catch them, tap them, translate them back into words again. And now they are going to give people a Receiving Set; and every night they are going to flash out from 5 to 11 those messages that they have caught, and sitting in your house you will be able to hear a singer in Edinburgh, or a speaker in London, hear whether your particular favourite among the football or the cricket teams has lost or won, though it was playing far away.

It's a queer thing, isn't it, that these messages are flashing about everywhere. But we don't hear, because we have no Receiving Set.

Yes, but there are far more wonderful messages flying about. Always God is speaking, telling us what to do, or showing us the way to do it, helping us when we are in a fix, calling out to us, when we are tempted, to be brave and true. And the churches are just the centres where they catch and pick up these messages, and 'broadcast' them, fling them out again for every one to hear. And some do hear, but some don't, because they have no Receiving Set. You know the bonnie story of old Eli in the Temple lying fast asleep and hearing

nothing: and Samuel, the little lad who couldn't help hearing a voice that talked to him quite plainly; how the old man at first was puzzled about it, said it was all nonsense, that there was nothing to be heard, but by and by saw what it meant. God was speaking, and the boy had a Receiving Set, and so could hear; while he himself had none, or had lost his, or broken it.

Wouldn't it be splendid to have a Receiving Set, to hear God speak to us! Well, you can have it, if you like. It costs nothing at all. Ask God your Father for it and He'll love to give it you. And we can't get it any other way. It's a wonderful present, but He never grudges anything, will give you even this. And the Receiving Set with which we hear God is called Faith. That bores you, doesn't it? When the man in the pulpit begins talking about faith, you just stop listening; are far away, at school, or in the playing field, or in the country wandering again up the stream where you caught your biggest trout; but mother is listening with all her ears. She is interested in His Wireless. She wants to hear God speak, she thinks the faith that makes it possible is the most wonderful and splendid thing in all the world, far more wonderful than electricity, or radium, or anything else. Don't you think you would like one of these sets? Wouldn't you care to hear the messages from God coming through? What kind of things does God say? Well, here's one He keeps sending through. If you had a Receiving Set you would hear this. You know how difficult it is to stand up to things, not to sulk, not to grow grumpy in a losing game, how hard to be true when you are in a hole. If you had a Receiving Set at such times you would hear God sending this message, Hold on, don't give in, all Heaven is hurrying to help you. I remember lying in a Pill Box up behind Passchendale out in the War, when a tremendous barrage was let loose on us, hours of it. The Pill Box was hit, and hit again, it shook like a jelly, and all the candles were blown out, and still the shells came on; until at last the colonel ordered the adjutant to phone back to Brigade Headquarters to get the British guns turned on. By and by, back came the word that the message had been sent back to the gunners, a little longer and word came along the wire that they had got it and were getting ready. Cheer up, they said, we'll settle them for you. A little longer, and far and far away came the dull boom of guns, and the shells went whistling and screaming over us. And then one felt far better. Before, we had felt lonely and cut off there with the enemy doing much as he liked with us, but that message told us we were not alone, had the whole British Empire at our back, and so, if you had a Receiving Set and listened when you are tempted, you would find out that you aren't just a small boy or girl left all alone to stand up to your tempter, but that you have God behind you. 'Cheer up,' He says, 'don't give in, I'll settle it for you,' and with that His guns begin to fire, and the enemy is silenced.

The Christian Year.

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Christianity and Politics.

'As free, and not using your freedom for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.'—1 P $2^{16.17}$.

Christianity has very much to do with the great principles of political and social questions. You will not, indeed, as a rule, find its teaching expressly and formally directed to national life at all. For the stock examples of patriotism and love of freedom we still quote the worthies of ancient Greece and Rome. For the Scriptural examples of deep love of country and loyalty to its head, we still turn to the pages of the Old Testament, as in the cry, 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.' 'O pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee.' But this results partly from the circumstances under which the New Testament was written, partly from the great ideas which it had to enunciate. If we look to circumstances, we observe that, when the Gospel was first preached, it was addressed to those who, under the universal despotism of Rome, had lost all opportunity of free national life. If we look to what is of infinitely more consequence—the essential spirit and glory of the Gospel—we see that it has to deal with universal and eternal principles, identified with no forms of social and political life, able to rule and inspire all, yet bound up essentially with none. But yet, under the sway of these principles, the nation has become what in the first days it was not—the unit of human Society. The national life in every Christian

country has developed itself with a singular intensity of power; and the fire of patriotism and loyalty has burnt all the more brightly, because the Gospel has broken down the barriers which seemed to guard, but tended to choke it, and has let in upon it the free air of heaven. The power of the Gospel has always been directed to give life to great universal principles, leaving them to work for themselves in all their natural spheres of action, whether the family, the nation, or the race.

Is this not so in the case before us? The three great requisites for political life are the love of freedom, the spirit of loyalty, and the enthusiasm of brotherhood, or patriotism. See with what singular simplicity and vividness these are brought out to us in the words of the text!

1. *The spirit of freedom*—'as free, and not using liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.' Note here the true spirit of freedom in the assertion of our own rights and liberty of action, not for 'maliciousness'—not (that is) for our own selfish purposes, or even for the wantonness of reckless exercise; but 'for the service of God,' that is, for the glorious privilege of fellow-working with Him, and in that fellowship of following the Lord Jesus Christ, by devotion to the happiness and goodness of His creatures. What could better describe the social and political aspect of freedom, as it is concerned not with our own individual work in life, but with the part which we are called upon to take in the great life of our nation? It is, indeed, thus only that it can be preserved; thus only can it be a blessing to the world. If once an individual, a class, a nation, which has been made free, either in an indolent or cowardly tameness cares not to assert its freedom, or in a spirit of maliciousness asserts it simply as a means of wealth and ease, of glory and power, then has it fallen from its birthright of glorious liberty; and history confirms the sentence of Holy Scripture, that it shall be, as it deserves to be, 'a servant of servants,' a slave of slaves.

2. *The spirit of loyalty*—'Fear God. Honour the king.' The two principles seldom are, never ought to be, separate. If the king is honoured, being himself a mere man, it must be because God is feared; because (in the grand words of the Old Testament) the king is 'the Lord's anointed,' or (as the New Testament more philosophically extends the idea) 'the powers that be are ordained as vicegerents of God.' Never, of course, can they be absolute vicegerents. There is to us but one Supreme King, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. All other authorities, whether in Church or State, are simply His imperfect representatives. But yet they are true vicegerents. They act under limitations, which they may not pass, under laws which are based on right, and not on arbitrary will; so fulfilling the purpose of God's Providence; so bearing a large share of the burden of humanity. Therefore, they claim at our hands, for His sake, true loyalty; which implies (be it remembered) not only obedience but reverence, not only duty but love. It is impossible not to remind ourselves that to us, far more than to those whom St. Peter addressed, that precept should come home. For he wrote to men who were living under a foreign despotism, wielding as its sceptre a ruthless sword. He wrote at a time when that sceptre was swayed by a Nero, with hands soon to be deeply stained, through mere cruelty and slanderous recklessness, with Christian blood. We have a rule over us, which is, in the truest sense, representative of the free life of the people; and that peaceful and righteous rule is at this moment invested, by the unanimous testimony of all, with the sacredness of deep personal reverence. Well, indeed, is it for us. For never can a country prosper, unless the chief authority be hedged round with reverence. Never will it greatly prosper, if that reverence be untinged by some glow of love.

3. But beyond freedom and loyalty there is *the spirit of brotherhood.* 'Honour all men'—give (that is) to all, high and low, the respect, the consideration, the rights which are their due. In these words we trace the spirit of humility and forbearance, deference and respect for others, which limits the self-assertion of the strong individual, or the overwhelming majority. 'Love the brotherhood'—in these words breathes the spirit of enthusiastic self-sacrifice for the whole community, which counts self as a little thing, which esteems it a joy and a privilege to live and to die for all.

It is true that these commands are not confined to the body politic. The first extends far beyond it, to the whole race of man. The second looks especially to the brotherhood of the Christian Church, of which one essential characteristic is that it is Catholic or Universal, co-extensive in capacity and promise with all humanity. Nor shall we fail to discover that this truth is of great

significance, in preventing that absolute absorption in social and political interests which degrades our own highest humanity, and that idolatry of patriotism to one single country which may easily become inhuman to others. But, nevertheless, the principles of this deference and self-sacrifice must apply, in its right measure and degree, to every community of which we are members; and certainly in no doubtful application to the nation, especially if it be a free nation and therefore a true brotherhood. We cannot call Christianity a religion of equality. For equality is a dangerously ambiguous word; in one sense it is a sacred and priceless truth; and in another it is an unnatural and impossible figment. But the other two names of the famous triad it certainly may assume. It is unquestionably a religion of liberty and fraternity; yet a liberty restrained and tempered by loyalty; a fraternity recognizing one Almighty Father, and so reverencing all who bear mission from Him. There can hardly be nobler elements of the true political life. They can hardly be more plainly taught, more vividly enforced, than in the pages of the New Testament. How, therefore, if we are Christians indeed, can we fail to rekindle at the altar of our Christianity the undying fire of high social and political aspiration?

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Temptations of Middle Life.

'In the midst of the years.'—Hab 3^2.

What are the temptations that especially assail the middle-aged?

1. One of the most obvious is the hardening of the mental tissue. It is a familiar saying that a man is as old as his arteries. When these begin to harden old age is at hand, and death is not far behind. And there is an intellectual sclerosis that is the forerunner of intellectual death. And just as a wise man will seek by wise means to ward off the physical peril, so it is the duty of those who have passed the mid-time of their years to watch against the stiffening of their mental joints, to keep their minds hospitable to new ideas. We are not called to make our own all the new thoughts of a new time; we are called to meet them with understanding and with charity, and to resist the temptation through sheer inertia to throw ourselves unthinkingly on the side of things as they are. I can recall no better illustration of how this may be done than the late Dr. John Shaw Banks. I was not one of his students, nor was I ever personally intimate with him. If one may judge from his writings, his natural leanings were all towards the older, more conservative schools of thought. Yet I never listened to him without feeling that behind the rather ungainly manner of his speech there lay a hospitality of soul that was truly regal. He kept his intellectual sympathies alive and alert to the last, and so perpetually was the miracle of renewal wrought in him that when he died, over eighty years of age though he was, the younger ministers of his Church felt that they had lost in him, not only a father, but a brother.

2. Another temptation of middle life is to yield to the spirit of weariness. In part, of course, it is due to causes that are beyond our control. As life goes on we tire more easily, the fire burns less brightly. It was said of Adam Clarke that his heart to the last leapt up when he beheld a rainbow in the sky. But most men are not so fortunate; they have to confess themselves powerless against the years. And sometimes our weariness springs from disappointed hopes. Once we thought the prize was to be ours; now we know that, here at least, we shall never be crowned. When we set out on the journey we expected to go far; now we know that the top of the road has been reached, and that for the rest of the way it will dip steadily towards the twilight and the darkness. Why, then, should we concern ourselves? Toil and trouble, trouble and toil—what is the good of it all? There are few men, I suppose, in their fifties who have not known that evil mood.

3. And then close behind weariness comes cynicism, the temper of the man who has persuaded himself of what Mrs. Humphry Ward calls 'the uselessness of utterance, the futility of enthusiasm, the inaccessibility of the ideal, the practical absurdity of trying to realise any of the mind's inward dreams.' That is the cynical temper, and we know how it works. It has not only put out its own fire, but it has its bucket of water always handy for the fire of another. Above all it loves to frown down the generous enthusiasms of eager youth: 'Ah! so I thought when I was your age.' Of all evil spirits that can possess a man I wonder if that is not the damnablest. And middle age in the pulpit may fall its victim as readily as middle age in the pew. A youth leaves college all aglow with splendid ambitions to set a

wrong world right; but at fifty the vision has faded; he is content to let things take their course, sure that he at least can do nothing to mend them. And so you get that deadly paralysis in which routine is maintained only by force of habit —the abomination of desolation in the Church of the living God. It was that kind of thing in other walks of life that led Dr. Osler to declare that a man was 'too old at forty,' and that after sixty he should be quietly put away. But there is no need that these things should be. Even in the midst of the years it is still possible to be gaining new interests and forming new ties; we may still refuse to faint or be discouraged; so that even when the end comes it may find us, like Gladstone and Booth and Clifford, still dreaming our dreams and seeing our visions, and in the strength of them doing many wondrous works.[1]

Twentieth Sunday after Trinity.

The Race of Life.

'Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith.'—Heb $12^{1.2}$.

This passage presents to our imaginations a scene which was familiar to the people of that age, and especially to those who had been present at the great games of Greece or had heard them described. The games always included a foot race; and a foot race then was very much what it is now. The competitors were obliged to put themselves in training. Strict temperance was indispensable for any one who hoped to do well in the race. When the hour came, the course was cleared, and the eager spectators placed themselves where they thought they would best be able to watch the runners. These presented themselves at the starting-point, stripped of all but the lightest and least cumbersome clothing. They saw before them the goal for which they were to make. When they were started, they aimed at going as directly as they could towards the goal, and they were stimulated by the shouts of the spectators to put forth their utmost efforts.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the writer compares himself and his fellow-Christians to these runners in a race. They were compassed about, he says, by a great cloud of witnesses. He means by witnesses persons who bore witness to the faithfulness of God. He has been giving examples of faith, which he takes from the Old Testament Scriptures. All the faithful men of Jewish history had been bearing witness in various ways to the God in whom they believed—each being ready to say at the end of his life to those around him, 'Let one more attest, I have lived, seen God's hand through a lifetime, and all was for best.' They were so many as to form a multitude like a cloud. A life of faith and service is like a foot-race in this, that we must cast off, for our spiritual effort, whatever would hamper our running. The sin which so easily besets us, or clings round us, must be laid aside. And further, as the eyes of runners are fixed on the goal, so for our spiritual course there is an object on which we ought to keep our eyes fixed. Christians are to look to Jesus, the author and perfecter of their faith. In one point the Christian life does *not* resemble a race. We do not want to outstrip and defeat one another: a part of our success, on the contrary, consists in our becoming more able to help one another. The points of resemblance to which our attention is called are these—(1) that we are encouraged by a multitude of our fellow-men, (2) that we have to rid ourselves of what would cumber and hinder us, (3) that we have a course marked out along which we are to run, and (4) that there is an object on which our eyes are to be fixed.

1. Consider with how much greater force an appeal might now be made to a cloud of witnesses. The Israelite was reminded of Abraham and Moses, of David and Samuel, and the prophets; but we have the testimony of Peter and Paul and John, of Stephen and Polycarp and Ignatius. And think what a mass of testimony has been accumulating since those first days! The time would fail us, it would be indeed an endless task, to name the bright examples of Christian faith and heroism—those innumerable stars which make up the milky way of Christian history. We all have the New Testament in our hands; but that volume only covers a generation or two of the Church when it was at its smallest. From each one of the eighteen centuries which have followed the first may be culled records of Christian men and women who for some reason or other have become prominent in the Church, down to those of our own day. Have we not also had the happiness of knowing

[1] G. Jackson, *Reasonable Religion*, p. 47 ff.

personally some good Christians, whose lives were obscure, perhaps, and attracted little observation beyond their own circle, but were manifestly guided and sustained by faith in Christ and the Father? All the steadfast and patient Christians that have ever lived have left their testimony behind them, to be an encouragement and stimulus to others, to point the way, to move us to shame, to assure us that we shall do well to believe and to live like them. Take the hint to value Christian biographies, and to consider reverently the work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope, which may be seen in the lives of good Christians.

2. Encouraged by these witnesses, we are called upon to lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us. What are the things of which we are to strip ourselves? Anything and everything which would hamper and impede us in the race we are to run. All who have said, 'It is our business to become as holy as possible,' have said rightly: but some in many ages have gone on to say wrongly, what was not said by the first followers of Christ, 'In order to cultivate holiness, we must withdraw ourselves from the world, and rid ourselves of the cares and temptations of family life, of industrial pursuits, of social intercourse.' No, these are not to be renounced: they form part of ourselves, and are rather our flesh and blood than clothes which we put on. The real impediments to be got rid of are sinful dispositions and habits. These things are injurious to our fellow-men and the world in which we live, as well as to ourselves; these cling round the inner man, as wet garments round the swimmer, and prevent him from putting forth his energies. Let the inner man be free and vigorous, and in good training, and he need not fear roughness of the ground or any outward thing that may put itself in his way.

3. There is a race set before us. For each of us there is a course marked out by authority. So far as events are concerned, no one can foresee what his life is to be. The things that happen to us are often very different from what we might have expected. But the principles of the Christian life are sufficiently laid down for us. The essential duties and virtues are the same for all. We all have to be honest, upright, truthful; masters of our appetites and passions; considerate and forbearing, kindly and helpful towards all: and every Christian is to find the way and the power to fulfil these duties by accepting from God the forgiveness of his sins, and believing in Christ and the Father, and rendering himself up in grateful obedience to the Divine will. This is the running for which sin will fatally impede us. The aim of each must be, in familiar words, to do his duty in that state of life to which it shall please God to call him. Whether God shall call him to be married or to be single, to be a parent or to be childless, to serve an employer or to employ others, to work with his hands or with his head—in every state the Christian is to be loyal and diligent, fulfilling cheerfully as unto Christ the obligations of every condition. That is the race set before us.

4. And at every step of the onward course the loyal Christian will see the Lord Jesus Christ before him. We are to run with our eyes on 'Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith.' We advance from faith unto faith. It is through Jesus the Son of God that we are persuaded to believe in the Father; by continually studying Him we are drawn into more assured trust, into more and more unreserved and satisfying surrender. The teachers of the first Christians, whose exhortations we read in the New Testament, had to be always thinking of them as undergoing or as likely to undergo persecution. In order that they might endure it patiently and with enthusiasm, they were bidden to look upon Jesus the Sufferer. If Jesus had suffered, why—they were bidden to ask themselves—should not *they* suffer? And if He had suffered on His way to a throne and a crown, might they not hope that, if they suffered with Him as His faithful followers and witnesses, they would also share His glory? There are sufferings now, trials small and great, continuous hardships, here and there overwhelming afflictions: but on the whole—so much has human life been bettered—we have to think of ourselves as more in danger from pleasure than from pain; and, this being the case, we have sometimes to change the key of the New Testament exhortations. Let those who have a happy or a very endurable life before them look no less unto Jesus, that they may be drawn by a powerful magnetism out of levity and frivolity, out of worldly ambition, out of illegitimate self-indulgence, out of careless or cowardly acquiescence in evil. Let them look unto Jesus, as unto the Lord to whom they hope to come nearer and nearer, in whose hand are the true leading-strings of the world, whose mind is

the law of all genuine progress. Christians have perhaps been too much in the habit of looking back to Jesus. He is in the past, certainly: a most touching figure, whether we bring Him to mind as the Babe of Bethlehem, or as the victim of malice and cruelty on the Cross; a commanding figure, when we listen to Him speaking to His followers or the multitudes or His persecutors with heavenly authority. But He is before us also, and the future should be illuminated to us by the grace and truth which shine triumphantly from Him.

> We see by the glad light,
> And breathe the sweet air, of futurity;
> And so we live, or else we have no life.

It is our privilege to go forward in hope of the glory of God, to labour to bring both ourselves and the bit of the world around us into more thorough subjection to Christ.

Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity.

The Secret.

'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.'—Ps 25^{14}.

The religious life—faith in God, the habitual consciousness of His presence, and the power of prayer or communion with Him—has a secret of its own. And it is a secret of a kind very hard indeed to reveal to anybody who seems to be without it. This natural reserve about religion also exists in relation to other things. All non-material pursuits have their secret too. Persons who are not addicted to intellectual habits may not easily perceive the delight of any one of them. Art too has its secret. And although music in some way or other is understood and cared for by more people than any other single branch of art, or by a larger number of people perhaps than any one branch of intellectual activity; yet there are intricacies of harmony and of orchestration presenting an extraordinary charm to those who understand them, but having no meaning whatever to the uninitiated. You cannot explain the beauty and the interest of that wonderful five-fugued chorus of Sebastian Bach to a person who cannot read music. It would be true then to say of it that its secret is with them that understand it, or that have been moved by it. The limitations of the individual understanding, or of the capacity for study, are somewhat sharply defined in several subjects. Even if we had the capacity, life would be too short to master everything about them which has an interest for us. Religion, however, unlike any branch of art or any single department of the intellectual life, does from its very nature concern every human being, and is capable, to use a rather hackneyed phrase, of appealing to anybody. And yet, with all its universal concern and its unlimited appeal, it nevertheless has its secret. It not merely has its secret, but it is strangely distinguished by that very feature.

1. A secret sometimes means darkness, a closed door, something which is impenetrable, and therefore unlikely to be proved by language. But in the sense in which the Psalmist is understood to use the word, darkness is certainly not the meaning of it. It would seem to be used rather in the sense in which one might speak of the secret of some rare friendship. Two persons may be drawn together by an unspeakable tie of sympathy and affection. There is an affinity between them. Their opinions and their creed may be different, and they may have no tie of blood, and yet they have been drawn together through a long series of years, almost a lifetime, in a way that is not very common even among near relations. The secret of such a friendship is understood by themselves, and perhaps by no one else. 'What can he or she find in so-and-so to care so very much about?' the casual onlooker might remark. Yet it is a friendship which abides through all manner of changes in the conditions of either of them. The real secret in that case is of course love, whatever may have been the incidents or the accidents which first prompted the friendship.

2. But it is not often that we can find a true and tried friend into whose willing ear and sympathetic heart we can tell our deepest secrets, whether of joy or sorrow. We are not sufficiently acquainted with the carrying capacity of some of our friends; and whether in some way or other they may not damp our joys by some discordant criticism of their cause, or whether they may not deepen our sorrow by some incongruous flippancy. It is because true friends are so rare amongst our fellow-mortals that we are drawn into the warm sympathy and eternal security of the friendship of God, by whom the secrets of our hopes and fears, our joys and sorrows, are received with a father's tenderness, and kept to our honour and

well-being. What we commit to His trust, He is both able and willing to keep.

Confidence begets confidence, and the first to repose that confidence must be the weaker and the less wise. We are quick to detect, in the approaches of our bosom friend, that he is ready to congratulate us in our joys and condole with us in our sorrows; the disposition to receive our confidence and to deserve it is there, and we know it will not fail us. It is so with the Friend of all friends; if one diligently observes His coming—His approaches to us—they may soon discover that there are no pure joys in life and no real sorrows that are not His approaches, and that to observe them, respond to them, and open our heart, in the confidence of waiting and worshipping children, is to win His confidence in return.

'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will shew them His *friendship*' (R.V. margin). It is this covenanting friendship which shows the human tendencies and tenderness in the character of the Divine Father, and seals, in outflowing love and compassion, His relationship with His children. He has many friends, even bosom friends, amongst His children—why should not all be?—and shows Himself friendly, speaking to them His words, disclosing His secret, and revealing His covenant.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

God's Abundance.

'Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.'—Eph 3^{20}.

This man Paul excelled in many things, and in few things more than in letter-writing. All his epistles are remarkable; some of them are wonderful. One of the greatest marvels about them is this—that of all his letters the most spiritual, the most elevated and joyous, the most heart-touching and delightful are those which he wrote either while he was in a prison or had the gaoler's chain upon his arm. It seems as though when the gates of brass were shut around him the gates of gold were specially opened above him. It seems as though, when the keys of the gaoler locked him in, He who had the master-key at His girdle opened the door to let him out—out into the freedom and sunshine of those who, independent of circumstances, can walk and talk with God. Paul the prisoner becomes Paul the prince of preachers and teachers, and his royalty impresses every page. Strange, is it not, that the chain upon his arm adds a charm to his pen? Now, if you were to ask him for an explanation of this strange scene—if you were to say, 'How is it, Paul, that you are so completely king of your surroundings—that the features of a prison take the graces of a palace—that a cheery song, worthy of a bright landscape and a blue sky, can be sung in the gloom of an iron cage? How is it?' I think that his answer would be, 'God is able to do exceeding abundantly above all I ask or think.' That grand truth inspired his soul, and took full possession of him, and so his heart and his hand kept time to the same beat. The pulse stroke and the pen stroke went in pairs; and if ever letter was written by a human hand that had an inspired human heart behind it, it is this transcendent epistle indited behind prison bars. It was Paul's lifelong joy to announce everywhere that the salvation of Jesus was free to all the world, and that the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile was broken down; and so he travelled everywhere, along all the European and Asiatic highways, offering to everybody, gentle and simple, the unsearchable riches of Christ.

1. Had the apostle only said that God is able to do all that we *ask*, his statement would have been enough to give us confidence in prayer. But it is a much more assuring thing to be told that God is able to do all we *think*. We may be limited in our asking by various causes. Timidity may cause us to limit our requests. Inability to embody our desires in words may prevent our asking the things we should like to receive. We can think them, but we cannot give expression to our thoughts so as to convert them into prayers. But here we are told that what things we can think, we are justified in expecting, for God is able to do not only all we ask but all we think. And this we may say confidently, that if our thoughts are in the line of the Spirit's teaching—if we think what is good, what is gracious, what is glorious, what is fitted to shed lustre on the Divine perfections, and to make them appear glorious in the eyes of God's creatures, what is fitted to minister to the blessedness and the true dignity of His chosen ones—we cannot think what is too great or too good for God to do, for He is able to do *all* that we ask or think.

2. But this is not all that the apostle says. The

Lord is not only able to do all that we ask or think, but *above* all, in excess of all, beyond all. Higher than our highest thought, His power to do reaches. Higher than the highest thought of any of His creatures. Paul's discursive, soaring mind, in its wide and lofty flights, may see wonderful things, things which it is not lawful for him to utter, because they so much surpass our present imaginings that they might shake our faith, if not becloud our reason. John's eagle *eye*, purged by pain, strengthened by devout meditations in the solitude of Patmos, lighted up by Divine inspiration, may see apocalyptic splendours which dazzle us by their brightness and their glory. But neither Paul's nor John's thinking can equal the Divine power to do. He is able to do above all that either Paul or John can ask or think.

3. Nor is it a bare surpassing even, to which the apostle testifies, as if God's power rose just above our thinking, and scarcely more; overtopping, but barely overtopping it. God's power is thus not nearly matched by man's thinking. 'He is able to do *abundantly* above all that we ask or think.' But even this is not all. Paul has a yet stronger word by which he gives intensity to all the others. Abundantly is not enough for him; there is something even beyond abundance. 'God is able to do *exceeding* abundantly.' Further than this language cannot go. He might repeat himself, but he could scarcely intensify, even by repetition, what he has here said: 'Exceeding abundantly above all we ask or think.'

Sir Robert Ball tells us that the sun could heat and light two thousand million worlds like ours. Suppose a man to be left eight million pounds, and of that eight million to spend a penny wisely, but to waste and throw away all the rest, you would say of all the extravagant people you had ever heard of, he was the most spendthrift and extravagant. Well, Sir Robert Ball tells us that if eight million pounds' worth of heat emanated from the sun, we would not be able to secure and make use of on this earth more than the value of a pennyworth. There are other planets which use it, of course, but when every allowance is made for what they consume, there cannot be a doubt that by far the greater quantity of the heat and light given out by the sun is apparently wasted. It isn't needed in this world. Yet God made the universe on this tremendously liberal scale. Nothing is too great or too good for the man He has made. He withholds nothing from us—not even His Son—that He may show His love for us.

The Early Amorite King Humbaba.

By Professor A. T. Clay, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Yale University.

It is generally understood that in certain Aryan lands gods became men. Many scholars maintain that the same has occurred with the Semites. They have said that Nimrod, the patriarchs, and many other Biblical characters were originally deities; that Etana, Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and many other Babylonian rulers had also descended from the realms of mythology. Fortunately clay tablets, which are not as perishable as skins and papyrus, have recently furnished us with the material whereby some of these so-called deities are restored to their places in dynastic lists, and whereby it is possible to assert that it cannot be proved that gods ever became mortals in the Semitic world. The order must be exactly reversed. While anthropomorphic ideas are attributed to the deities, we have no instance of a Semitic god becoming a man. Perhaps it will be found that even more of the gods of Persia and India, who became mortals, had originally been human beings.

Etana has recently been restored to his place as a ruler in the earliest known dynasty, where he is called a 'shepherd.' The unpublished text in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, which figures in what follows, calls him 'king.' Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and other rulers who had been deified, are now known to have been kings. From what follows, Humbaba, the despot with whom Gilgamesh fought, proves also to have been a human being, and to have been one of the earliest kings of the country later called Amurru, or the land of the Amorites. As a result there follow far-reaching and important conclusions as regards the early history and culture of this land.

The stronghold of Humbaba, with whom Gilgamesh fought as related in the epic bearing his name, has generally been located in the past in Elam; and it has also been generally held that the name is Elamitic. These conclusions have not rested upon the fact that cedar forests were known to have existed in Elam, for all the numerous references to cedars have been understood to refer to the Lebanon and Amanus ranges. The conclusions rested solely upon the slight resemblance of the name Humbaba to that of the Elamite god Humba, which is also written Humman, Humban, Umman, Umba, etc. The identification with this deity was also one of the reasons why emphasis was placed upon the Gilgamesh Epic being based upon a foundation of myth. A comparison of the name was made with Kombabos of the legend of Lucian concerning the building of the temple at Hieropolis, but the name continued to be identified with the Elamite god.[1] While others realized that the description of the cedars seemed to suggest the districts in the West, nevertheless the forests were considered to be in Elam.[2]

In the omen literature a word read *ḫu-pi-pi* occurs several times which has been regarded generally to be the name of an animal; and even has been translated 'hyena.'[3] The same word occurs as a personal name in the early period. This word, strange to say, has also been regarded as an Elamitic loan-word, but on the basis of the reduplication of the final consonant.[4]

A few years ago an Amorite Name Syllabary was published, which contained *Ḫu-pi-pi*.[5] The more recent discovery that in the Yale tablet of the old Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, the familiar name Humbaba is written exactly the same, showed that the correct reading of the word in the omen texts, and of the personal name, was not *Ḫu-pi-pi* but *Ḫu-wa-wa*, which reproduced the pronunciation of *Ḫu-ba-ba*. The name proved to be the same as that of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (Nu 10^{29}); and it is unquestionably the same as Kombabos of Lucian.[6] Furthermore, it naturally followed that the reference to the conflict between Gilgamesh of Erech and Humbaba of the West was an allusion to an important historical event of the early period.[7] Additional light is now thrown upon the situation from an omen text in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection.

It is a well-established idea that the definite historical allusions to which omens refer were originally supplied by actual events that followed the appearance of the prognosticating signs which the priests had observed. Following are a few of the omens referring to historical events.

'If the fœtus is male and female (a monstrosity); it is the omen of Bau-ellit, who ruled the land; the king's country will be seized.'[8] It is now definitely known that this woman, Bau-ellit, overthrew the rule of Akshak, and established the fourth dynasty of Kish.

No less than eleven historical omens are known which bear upon Sargon's reign. In one of them the expression 'he possessed no foe nor rival,' meaning he had subdued the neighbouring lands, is fully borne out by many discoveries.

There are two well-known omens relating to Narâm-Sin, one referring to his overthrow of Apirak, and the other to his conquest of Magan. The former is summarized in the eighteenth line in the Morgan text, which reads: 'If the *tirani* is like a woolen rope; it is the omen of Narâm-Sin, who overthrew Apirak in arms.' This is fully confirmed by the chronicles of Babylonian kings.[9]

Another omen referring to the founder of a dynasty reads: 'If a sheep gives birth to an ox, etc., it is the omen of Ishbi-Urra, who did not have a rival.'[10] We now have historical data to show that this Amorite, from the city of Mari, overthrew the third dynasty of Ur, and became the founder of the Nîsin dynasty.[11] These examples suffice to show that omens of this character unquestionably refer to historical events, and notably to great conquerors who overthrew dynasties, as well as to subjugating enemies.

The two omens referring to Huwawa have been known for some time; one reads: 'If a woman give birth to the face of Huwawa, the king and his sons will leave the city.'[12] The other is, 'If a sheep bear a lion, and it has the face of Huwawa, the prince will not have a rival; he will destroy

[1] Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, p. 77.
[2] Gressmann, *ibid.* p. 111.
[3] Hölma, *Namen der Körperteile*, p. 152.
[4] Weidner, *O.L.Z.* 17, p. 502.
[5] Chiera, *Lists of Personal Names*, p. 122.
[6] It is not improbable that Lucian's tradition contains a reflexion of the ancient Humbaba, who may have built or rebuilt the temple.
[7] Clay, *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 88.
[8] *C.T.* 28. 6 : 1 f.
[9] King, *Chronicles*, i. 32 ff.
[10] *C.T.* 27. 22 : 21.
[11] *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 107.
[12] *C.T.* 27. 3 : 17=4 : 9=6 : 4.

the land of the enemy.'[1] In the omen text of the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, this one is found in line 65: 'If the *tirani* is like the face of ^{d}Ḫum. Ḫum, a usurper of the land will rule the world.' A fragment in the British Museum duplicates the first part of six consecutive lines of this text (*i.e.* 63 to 68), the third of which reads: 'If the *tirani* is like the face of Ḫum-ba-ba, etc.,'[2] showing that the ideogram ^{d}Ḫum. Ḫum is to be read Humbaba. These omens can only be interpreted as meaning that Humbaba was a usurper, who, like Bau-ellit, Sargon, and Ishbi-Urra, overthrew a dynasty; conquered the lands; and was without a rival. The third interprets the other two; together they clearly indicate that Humbaba or Huwawa had been a mighty conqueror, and had doubtless subjugated Babylonia.

What the characteristic feature was which enabled the priests to associate the omen-sign with Huwawa is not clear. Jastrow has shown that Huwawa in omens is contrasted with *tigru*, 'dwarf.'[3] The character of Humbaba is described in the Gilgamesh Epic as a *dapini*, 'terrible one,' 'whose roar is a deluge, whose mouth is fire, whose breath is death.' The elders in their efforts to dissuade Gilgamesh from attempting to overthrow him, asked, 'Who has ever penetrated to his dwelling-place or capital in the heart of the cedar forest?' 'Who has ever opposed his weapon?' In short, the references to the despot seem to convey the idea that he was a powerful personage.

Gilgamesh also figures in the divination texts; among which the following has been found. 'If a woman give birth, and the (child) has the head of a snake: (it is) the omen of Nin-Gish-Zid-da who ravaged the land; (and it is) the omen of Gilgamesh who ruled the land, and who became "the king of hosts" in the land.'[4] It is clear from the Gilgamesh Epic, that Gilgamesh in the early part of his reign was subservient to another; and that he was able to overthrow his enemy.

The new chronological material bearing upon the early dynasties recently published, considered in connexion with all other data not known, gives us a fairly complete outline of historical events of this early period.[5] Following Mesh-kin-gasher and Enmer-kar, the first two kings of the early Erech dynasty, were Lugal Marda, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh. During the reigns of these kings we learn of contact with a great power in the West.

The so-called 'Legend of the Zu bird' acquaints us with the fact that an enemy designated as Zu, 'the storm bird,' not the 'personification of some solar deity,' but an invader who lived in an inaccessible distant mountain, had robbed Enlil of Nippur of his supremacy as 'lord of lands.' Lugal Marda, 'a shepherd,' came to the rescue, and succeeded in restoring Enlil to his position; for which he is in time credited with the title of 'Enlil of Kullab, Lugal Marda.'[6] In pursuit of Zu, it was to the 'distant mountain Sâbu' that Lugal Marda went. Sâbu was in the Lebanon range.[7] In other words, the enemy Zu represented an Amorite or West Semitic power which doubtless had invaded Babylonia.[8] The so-called 'Legend of the Zu' was doubtless intended to commemorate the overthrow of this power by Lugal Marda.

Delitzsch years ago conjectured that the name Nimrod was from *Nu-Marad*, 'man of Marad.' More recently Kraeling suggested that the original form was *En-Marad*, standing for Lugal-Marad.[9] If this 'shepherd' king should prove to be Nimrod, his Old Testament title, 'the mighty hunter,' or 'ensnarer,' may have reference to the strategy he employed in overthrowing the 'Zu bird.'

Lugal Marda is the most powerful king of this period at present known; and he is credited with having ruled longer than any other of his dynasty. The fragment of an historical text, recently published, shows that he conquered Halma (Aleppo) and Tidnum in the West; and it can be assumed that he ruled that land. This would give sufficient reason why his name should have been preserved in the traditions of the West. It is the only name of the Babylonian rulers of the early period that is preserved in the Old Testament. Moreover, his own habitat may originally have been in that land,

[1] *C.T.* 27. 21: 8. See also *C.T.* 28. 14: 12. Cf. also *Ḫu-um-ba-bi-tu*, *C.T.* 27: 6=27. 4–8.

[2] Boissier, *Divination*, p. 91.

[3] Religion, *Babyloniens*, ii. 913 f.

[4] *C.T.* 27. 1: 8–9.

[5] Poebel, *Historical Texts*, 88 ff.

[6] Given as the explanation of a star; cf. Rawlinson, v. 46. 1: 27.

[7] Jensen, *K.B.* vi. 1, p. 578; Zimmern, *K.A.T.*^{3} p. 574, note 3.

[8] A city Su was identified with Mari (*C.T.* 25. 35, 24–27). On Su as an element in geographical names, cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, and *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 177.

[9] See Prince's article *J.A.O.S.* 41, 201.

for his wife's name, although written in Sumerian, Nin-Sun,[1] was Semitic, namely, Rîmat-Bêlit; and her father bore the Amorite name Semak-Ur (Semachoros), a name like the Old Testament Semak-Jahu (Semachiah).[2]

Tammuz followed Lugal Marda as king of Erech. Babylonia had suffered another upheaval; Nun-Gish-Zid-da, 'his father, had ravaged the land,' as we learn from the omen. Besides this fact he is known only as a deity, with his habitat at Lagash. Doubtless he was king of that city.

Tammuz was not originally 'the personification of the son of the spring-time'; or 'the personification of some kind of wood'; but he was a human being, the fourth king of the early Erech dynasty.[3]

While legends concerning Tammuz (also called Adonis, etc.) and Ashirta (also called Astarte, Ashtaroth, ʿAthar, ʿAtar, Ashtar, Ishtar, Venus, Aphrodite, etc.) are of widespread origin, they are pre-eminently identified with Syria and the city of Erech in Babylonia. They cluster especially about a vale near Aphaca (Aphek, Jos 13[4]), at present represented by the modern Afka, at the head of the wild romantic wooded gorge of the Adonis river, in the Lebanon region, midway between Byblos and Ba'albec. Here tradition says the mangled body of the hunter was buried. Here are to be found many ruined monuments of his worship; one is that of a great temple of Astarte which Constantine destroyed. Another of the memorials that have kept the legends alive is now to be seen at Ghineh, where reliefs of Tammuz and Ashirta are carved upon the rocks. Tammuz is there portrayed with a spear awaiting an animal; while Ashirta is seated near by in a sorrowful attitude.[4]

The mother of Tammuz was named Zertu (also written Sirdu), which seems also to be Semitic. The name Tammuz was reproduced by two Sumerian words or ideograms, which represented the pronunciation, namely, Dumu-Zi, meaning 'faithful son'; but this is no proof that Tammuz was a Sumerian. His father's name, Nin-Gish-Zid-da, is also in a Sumerian dress; but this very probably also represents a Semitic name. His having ruled at Lagash would fully account for his name being written Sumerian.

The city Ḫa-A, whence Tammuz came, has not been located; but his connexions with the legends of Syria, and especially because of the passage concerning him in a lamentation hymn, which reads, 'at the sacred cedar, a distant place where he was born' (or 'where his mother bore him'), points to the West as his birthplace.[5] A number of passages show that he was worshipped at Hallab (Aleppo).[6] Certainly his connexion with Ashirta and the West would imply that he was a Semite rather than a Sumerian. Moreover, he very probably met a premature death by drowning, which can be gathered from several passages, while associating, in the Lebanon region, with his contemporary Ashirta, perhaps a queen of Sheba or a Cleopatra of that era, who had her seat of government at Hallab.

The chief seat of the cult of Ashirta or Ishtar in Babylonia was at Erech; but Hallab seems to have been her home. In a lamentation hymn we have this passage: 'The queen of Erech for her husband; the queen of Hallab for her husband (wails).' This and other couplets, referring to Ishtar or to Tammuz and Ishtar, show that these two cities were intimately identified with each other.[7] One of the earliest religious hymns known tells us she was from the land of Hallab.[8] In the Gilgamesh Epic when she proposes to Gilgamesh, she says: 'Come, Gilgamesh, be thou my spouse. Present me with thy offspring; be thou my husband, let me be thy wife; and I will set thee in a chariot, etc. . . . Into our house under the fragrance of the cedar tree, enter. And when thou enterest our house [they shall place thee upon] a throne; they shall kiss thy feet.' In refusing her advances, Gilgamesh asked her what she had done with Tammuz and her other husbands; whereupon she told the god Anu that Gilgamesh had upbraided her on account of her evil deeds; and she asked for vengeance. Certainly, there is sufficient evidence to show that the Babylonians not only looked upon her as having been a mortal, but also that the West was her habitat. Moreover, since

[1] Instead of following certain scholars in translating *ri-imtum ša su-pu-ri* ^{d}*Nin-Sun-na*, 'the wild cow of the stall, Nin-Sun,' this title of the mother-queen should be translated 'the beloved of the fortified city, Rîmat-Bêlit.' For Sun = *rîmtu*, cf. *S.A.I.* 6727.

[2] *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 84.

[3] Poebel, *Historical Texts*, p. 88.

[4] Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris*, i. p. 29.

[5] *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 83.

[6] *C.T.* 15, 26 : 5.

[7] Scheil, *R.A.* 8. 162, 4–5; *C.T.* 15. 19 : 4–7; and *C.T.* 15. 26 : 5–6, etc.

[8] Barton, *Babylonian Inscriptions*, i. col. 13 : 6.

Lugal Marda and his queen Nin-Sun, Nin-Gish-Zid-da and his queen Zerta, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and Humbaba, all the kings and queens of this period were worshipped as deities, the suggestion that Ashirta, also called Ishtar, the wife of Tammuz, had also been a mortal, seems to the writer to be a perfectly reasonable conjecture. That the worship of this deified woman should have become so widespread, was doubtless due to the peculiarity of her cult which appealed to the sensuality of man. Throughout Syria, including Phœnicia and Canaan, the unspeakable abominations of her licentious cult took deep root. It was not so in Babylonia and Assyria, especially in the early period; for the one city which stands out peculiarly in having temple prostitutes is Erech. It is this fact which prompted Sayce long ago to say that 'Erech was essentially a Semitic city.'[1] In short, in consideration of all that we know of Erech's contact with the West, it is not difficult to understand how her cult migrated to Babylonia from that region.

Gilgamesh was not connected with the family of Tammuz, but with that of the latter's predecessor. He was the son of Rîmat-Bêlit, the wife of Lugal Marda, and of the high priest of Kullab, a part of Erech, perhaps the Semitic quarter of that city. We are led to believe from the Epic of Gilgamesh that in the early part of his career Erech was subservient to another throne. Moreover, from the omen already referred to, we learn that one named Humbaba, who had usurped the throne of the West, had conquered the lands.

[1] *Gifford Lectures*, 1903, p. 342.

About this time another personage named Enkidu appeared on the scene, and became the ally of Gilgamesh. He 'had been reared in the mountains.' When the expedition to the West was being planned, he said to Gilgameṣh, 'Know, my friend, when I moved about with the cattle in the mountain, I penetrated to a distance of a double measure into the heart of the (cedar) forest, where Huwawa lived.' The name En-ki-Du, although written in Sumerian, was very probably Semitic, Ea-ṭâbu, or Baʿal-ṭôb;[2] and he was apparently another Western Semite. With his assistance Humbaba was overthrown, and Gilgamesh became 'king of hosts.' The epic bearing the name of Gilgamesh was originally written to commemorate that event.

If certain statements here presented are accepted as facts, namely, that Zu represents a power in the West; that the culture which existed at Hallab in the time of Tammuz, was Semitic; and that this ruler had relations with that city; that Hambaba, the contemporary of Gilgamesh (about 3900 B.C.), lived in the West land, and that he had humiliated Babylonia; then the thesis is unassailable that the history and culture of the country later designated as Amurru, 'the Land of the Amorites,' synchronize with the earliest known in Babylonia and Egypt. This being true, many prevailing theories concerning the Arabian origin of the Semites, Pan-Babylonism or the Babylonian origin of the Israel's culture and religion, etc., will need very considerable modification.

[2] Previously read Ea-bâni. The more ancient text reads Dú(g)=*ṭâbu*, instead of Dú=*bânu*.

Contributions and Comments.

'In League with the Stones of the Field.'

Several explanations have been given of this phrase in Job 5^{23}, which may be seen in the older commentators; for example, A. B. Davidson's early commentary on Job. Modern interpreters generally take the meaning to be that the stones keep out of his field. So Dillmann, Duhm, Budde, Volz, Driver and Gray. The expression is, it must be granted, somewhat curious, and it is not strange that the text has been questioned. Hence for 'stones,' 'lords' and 'sons' have been suggested, partly in reliance on ancient tradition. Dr. Bell prefers 'sons of the field,' translating the couplet:

> Having league with the children of the field,
> And the wild things being made thy friends.

He supposes that 'children of the field' is equivalent to 'the wild things,' the meaning being that the wild boar, the fox, etc., will no longer ravage

the fields and vineyards. Buttenwieser follows Kohler in reading 'lords of the field,' that is, the elves or gnomes who belong to the same class as the satyrs.

I quote from my own comment in the *Century Bible* to lead up to the communication which it is the object of this note to bring before the reader:

> 'There runs through much of the Old Testament a deep sense of the sympathy between man and nature, which often finds expression in the prophetic descriptions of the happy future. Here the thought is poetically expressed that he need not fear famine (verse 22), for the stones will keep out of his field. It can surely hardly be meant that the very stones will bring forth corn and fruit, we might in that case compare Matt. iii. 9, iv. 3.'

I have received the following from the Rev. T. J. Chapman of the Rectory, Alcester:

'In your commentary on Job, *Century Bible*, I note your remarks on v.[23]. It may interest you that a certain sheep station near Longreach in Queensland was the stoniest of all the stations I visited there. They varied in size up to that of a big turnip. When I remarked upon this peculiarity, the manager said the stones helped to grow the best grass anywhere, because they retained the heat after sundown and acted as a forcing-house on the grass.'

I do not know whether this confirms the general text or suggests the right interpretation, but I thought it sufficiently interesting to ask Mr. Chapman's permission to communicate it to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

Manchester.

St. Matt. xxv. 36; 2 Tim. i. 16-18.

IN Mt 25[31-46] we have a description of the Judgment Day; and in the list of deeds of mercy for which the righteous are rewarded is the visitation of those in prison: 'I was in prison and ye came unto me.' There is surely a very distinct and unmistakable reference to this passage in 2 Ti 1[16-18], where St. Paul mentions the kindness of Onesiphorus, who visited him in prison: 'He oft refreshed me and was not ashamed of my chain: but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently and found me. The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord *in that day*.' In none of the commentaries which I have at hand is there the faintest allusion to what seems to me the remarkable and interesting fact that in this epistle there should be such a definite reference to the Gospel of St. Matthew. The date of 2nd Timothy is, I presume, A.D. 66 or 67, and evidently at that time the First Gospel was in current use.

JOHN WILLCOCK.

Lerwick.

Concerning the Name 'Paraclete.'

FOUND only (of Holy Writ) in the writings ascribed to St. John, the word 'paraclete' is rendered 'Advocate' in the First Epistle, but 'Comforter' in the Gospel. Yet παράκλητος is the exact equivalent of *advocatus*, and, like it, is a word of passive meaning, and it is never used in the classics or in Rabbinical writings except as meaning 'advocate'—that is to say, as meaning a third person called in to speak for a second person before a first.

The paraclete is one of three, not of two: one of these sits to hear a cause pleaded, one stands on trial before that first; and there is also this third party who is called in to answer for that second party and act the part of his advocate.

This being so, it seems scarcely permissible to accept (unless for devotional reading) the rendering 'Comforter' as satisfying and giving truly the sense of the Scripture in question.

The suggestion here diffidently offered would permit the student as such to read 'Advocate' for παράκλητος in the Gospel as in the Epistle. He would conceive of Christ Jesus in the days of His flesh as God's advocate with men—he would think of God as sending in Christ's name 'Another Advocate' to plead for Christ with the Church and the disciple (and, by the Church and the disciple, with the world and men). Our Lord did, in the days of His flesh, do the work of an advocate for the Father—giving men the truth about God, showing men the things of God, revealing God as He is in truth. He advocated God's cause and His claim on men; He vindicated God's ways with men and pled for belief in His Fatherhood, His impartiality, His nearness and forgivingness. He fulfilled that word, 'Let us reason together . . . let us plead together.' To the last, till we lost

sight of Him in the cloud of the ascension, Christ's face was turned to man as Apostle and Advocate for the Father.

As now ascended He appears in the presence of God for man, and His face is turned from us to the Father. Now He pleads not with us for God, but with God for us. But God is not left without an advocate in earth—'Another' is come who speaks and pleads for Christ, as Christ had pled and spoken for the Father. He is come for the sake of the Church and of the disciple, that we may have 'a right judgement in all things.' It is His office to take of the things of Christ and show them to us, and to lead us into their truth—to open our eyes to their beauty and persuade us of their truth. He answers for God that He is Love, answers for Christ that He is the Faithful and True: He pleads with the soul that it may believe good concerning God and His way, God and His Kingdom and His righteousness. It is of His office in the Church and in the disciple, not speaking from Himself, to bring us in all things, as day follows day, to a right judgment.

Strange indeed is the tribunal if we consider the Pleader and the cause pleaded, but all this is work proper to an advocate, and for certain it is work which the Holy Spirit does. As for the world, upon it also the same Spirit acts, but, 'since the world receiveth him not, neither knoweth him'—upon it He works indirectly by the 'Spirit-bearing Body,' by the Spirit-bearing disciple (ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating men by their voices). It is fact that our Lord stands trial anew before each new generation of mankind, and, also, even (*teste* Girton) within the Church of God; but Christ now has many witnesses, a multitude which no one could number, and His Advocate 'shall not fail.'

ARTHUR W. WOTHERSPOON.

Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

FOR THE MINISTRY.

Christian Mysticism.

The Right Rev. Arthur Chandler, formerly Bishop of Bloemfontein, now Rector of Bentley St. Mary, has written a book on Christian Mysticism, calling it *First-Hand Religion* (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net). Few men are better fitted. For he has a clear mind as well as a devout heart, and he writes with simplicity.

Let us see what he means by Mysticism.

1. First, then, God has made us in His image, and therefore there is a germ of the divine in us, which has to be developed into the knowledge and love of God. Nothing short of this knowledge and love of God can satisfy the soul that He has made. This is a truth which is verified in the experience of all, and which might be described as the bedrock foundation of religion.

2. Secondly, Christianity aims at unfolding and setting out the meaning of this knowledge and love of God, together with the service which these demand. And the significance of our religion will vary according to the way in which we appropriate it and work at it. For instance, we can accept its teaching, and observe its rules of conduct, and experience feelings of love and gratitude to God, whilst these exercises of reason and will and heart are isolated in separate water-tight compartments, and not fused together into a living movement and attraction of the whole soul to God, a movement in which faith and love and works are inseparably combined.

And so, too, we can accept the Christian religion as a ready-made affair, which we take on trust, and which we feel no need or desire to verify for ourselves; we recognize that God has spoken in the Bible, and perhaps also in the Church, without expecting Him to speak in our own souls too.

This religion may be called conventional or second-hand, in the sense that it lacks the element of spiritual adventure, or the passionate quest of God by the united powers of the soul; and in the sense that it is not verified by that actual converse with God, and that living touch with Him, which would make it an actual first-hand experience of truth. But we must remember that such expressions as 'conventional' or 'second-hand' state the absence of certain qualities; they do not

deny the presence of other qualities. A man's religion may lack the note of mysticism and yet be earnest and firmly held, and bring great blessings on himself and others. It may be a type of religion which lays no great store by reflection or introspection, but it is often rich in good works and in the example of an unselfish and consistent Christian life. Perhaps 'extroverted' would be a better term to express it, because more free from any implication of disparagement. Such religion is not, indeed, turned inwards, as the mystic's is, but it is turned outwards to a loyal observance of God's commandments and to an exact fulfilment of the duties belonging to the state of life to which he has been called.

But at the same time it must be added that there is a great tendency for such religion to deteriorate, and to become conventional not only in the sense of being accepted ready-made or of consisting in a traditional routine of observances, but also in the sense of losing all vital significance, and becoming lifeless and unreal. And perhaps this danger is especially obvious in the Anglican Church. Our familiarity with set prayers and fixed forms of worship, the stereotyped iteration of exhortations like 'dearly beloved brethren,' combined sometimes with the droning monotony of a pulpit voice in the officiating minister; with the prominence often given to a form of service which makes little appeal to the imagination or the heart; and with the fact that priest and organist seem to conspire together to prevent our having a moment of silence in which to approach God quietly—all these things tend to have a deadening effect on the worship of God, which ought to be the very soul of religion. And when public worship becomes dull and lifeless, the rest of our religious life is apt to follow suit.

3. The third point is this. Mystical religion aims at the highest sort of reality—at converse with God, and union with God, Who is the sum and perfection of holiness and truth; therefore it is not a thing to be played with in a spirit of idle intellectual curiosity. It is not a matter for the intellect alone, but for the intellect in conjunction with the heart and will; it demands devotion and service as well as reasoning. If we take it up at all, we must be prepared to take trouble with it. In the first place, there must be a serious attempt at the mortification of self-will. The mystic is one who waits humbly upon God for indications of His will; and he cannot do that unless he is really trying to get rid of self-will, self-seeking, self-assertion, in whatever way they are manifested: in the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, or the pride of life. The spark of the divine which is in him must lead not only to dissatisfaction with earthly goods, but to mortification of the desire for them.

But the mortification of this comprehensive principle of pride and self-assertion is not an easy thing. Its antecedent condition is a thorough and honest repentance of past sin, with a readiness to do penance for it in the present; and its method of working is the resolute cutting off of the supplies of sin, and a resolute avoidance of occasions of sin. Repentance produces humility; mortification, or the gradual killing out of sin, produces freedom; and humility and freedom are essential parts of a mystic's outfit. He must be free to wait upon God in a humble readiness to do God's will.

And another thing that he wants, and which he will find it difficult to get, is patience and perseverance: Patience, the Queen of the Virtues, as S. Catherine of Siena calls it, who brings the virtues in her train. A very little experience tells us how sorely we need it; there are all sorts of discouragements; we seem to make no progress; a kind of false humility urges us to give up trying to do what is obviously too hard for us; whilst at other times presumption makes us want to attain to the goal at once, and tempts us to give up when we find that this cannot be done. We have to go on in dogged perseverance, being content at first with vague and confused ideas of God's will—vague because mixed up with unmortified notions of our own; gradually improving our methods; gradually relying more upon God, and less upon ourselves; gradually learning to control our imagination and fix our attention; gradually submitting ourselves more whole-heartedly to God's will, whatever that will may be; gradually rising from an appreciation of God's gifts to the love of Him who gives them, until the love of Him becomes the dominating power of our lives. Obviously, this is no light task; not one to be taken up as a fashionable fad, or an easy bit of occultism; it is one which demands the honest and strenuous dedication of a man's whole nature, and in particular the dedication of his will.

4. And now, fourthly, mysticism is an individual

type of religion; in that fact lies the secret alike of its strength and of its weakness, of its achievements and of its temptations. It is the individual soul's quest for God. The mystic enters upon that quest alone; alone he faces its difficulties: its adventures and discoveries are for him alone; he could not, if he would, communicate them to another; the contact of the soul with God is necessarily an ineffable experience.

This does not mean that the man isolates himself from his fellows; he may be closely engaged in business and in doing the duties that belong to him as a citizen and a Christian; but his religion is a very inward thing; its goal is an inward union of his soul with God, and the path is indicated by inward manifestations of God's directing will. And this fact, common to all mystical religion, necessarily involves dangers, and gives rise to a very common criticism.

Bishop Chandler proceeds to point out the dangers. But we need not follow him further. The book is sufficiently tested, both its science and its art, by the quotation already made. Dr. Chandler's books are always suggestive. Having thought, they create thought. And if they arrest occasionally they never disconcert in the end. The last point which he makes here is that Mysticism and the Church require each other.

SOME TOPICS.

McConnachie.

Before Sir James Barrie's Rectorial Lecture on *Courage* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net) is forgotten, and in order that it may not be altogether forgotten, let us repeat some of its sentences:

'I have utterly forgotten the address of the Rector of my time, and even who he was, but I recall vividly climbing up a statue to tie his colours round its neck and being hurled therefrom with contumely. We remember the important things.'

'Never ascribe to an opponent motives meaner than your own. There may be students here to-day who have decided this session to go in for immortality, and would like to know of an easy way of accomplishing it. That is a way, but not so easy as you think. Go through life without ever ascribing to your opponents motives meaner than your own. Nothing so lowers the moral currency; give it up, and be great.'

'Beware your betters bringing presents. What is wanted is something run by yourselves.'

'Carlyle, the king of all rectors, has always been accepted as the arch-apostle of toil, and has registered his many woes. But it will not do. Despite sickness, poortith, want and all, he was grinding all his life at the one job he revelled in. An extraordinarily happy man, though there is no direct proof that he thought so.'

'Henley says in that poem we were speaking of:

> Under the bludgeonings of Chance
> My head is bloody but unbowed.

A fine mouthful, but perhaps "My head is bloody and bowed" is better.'

'Don't forget to speak scornfully of the Victorian age; there will be time for meekness when you try to better it.'

And now let us convict Sir James Barrie of plagiarism. You remember McConnachie. Well, read this. It is a letter to his little girls by Joe Chandler Harris, the creator of Uncle Remus and Brer Rabbit. This is the letter: 'As for myself—though you could hardly call me a real, sure enough author—I never have anything but the vaguest ideas of what I am going to write; but when I take my pen in my hand the rust clears away, and the "other fellow" takes charge. You know all of us have two entities, or personalities. That is the reason you see and hear persons "talking to themselves." They are talking to the "other fellow." I have often asked my "other fellow" where he gets all his information, and how he can remember, in the nick of time, things that I have forgotten long ago; but he never satisfies my curiosity. He is simply a spectator of my folly until I seize a pen, and then he comes forward and takes charge.

'Sometimes I laugh heartily at what he writes. If you could see me at such times, and they are very frequent, you would no doubt say, "It is very conceited in that old man to laugh at his own writing." But that is the very point; it is not my writing at all; it is my "other fellow" doing the work and I am getting all the credit for it. Now, I'll admit that I write the editorials for the paper. The "other fellow" has nothing to do with them, and, so far as I am able to get his views on the

subject, he regards them with scorn and contempt; though there are rare occasions when he helps me out on a Sunday editorial. He is a creature hard to understand, but, so far as I can understand him, he's a very sour, surly fellow until I give him an opportunity to guide my pen in subjects congenial to him; whereas I am, as you know, jolly, good-natured, and entirely harmless.

'Now, my "other fellow," I am convinced, would do some damage if I didn't give him an opportunity to work off his energy in the way he delights. I say to him, "Now, here's an editor who says he will pay well for a short story. He wants it at once." Then I forget all about the matter, and go on writing editorials and taking Celery Compound, and presently my "other fellow" says sourly: "What about that story?" Then when night comes, I take up my pen, surrender unconditionally to my "other fellow," and out comes the story, and if it is a good story I am as much surprised as the people who read it. Now, my dear gals will think I am writing nonsense; but I am telling them the truth as near as I can get at the facts—for the "other fellow" is secretive. Well! so much for that. You can take a long breath now and rest yourselves.'

The Preacher as Scholar.

This is from the Hartley Lecture of Mr. Pickett (a Primitive Methodist preacher):

'Before and beyond any intellectual attainment, the work of preaching presupposes seclusion with Jesus. This always first and chief. The "laying on of hands" that matters, the really valid ordination, is the pressure of the "hands pierced for us." Nor, until we know and feel the steady and constant impact of His personality upon our own, waiting in profound reverence for Him as lovers, living with Him in the secret places of His love, can we expect to know His mind, or understand the treasures of grace He desires us to make known to others.

'This is not to undervalue the work of the study, nor is it to depreciate the place of true scholarship. It is rather to offer to that side of the preacher's work an unfailing incentive. It is deeply and permanently true, that the longing for, and the effort to secure the highest intellectual efficiency, will be in exact proportion to the intensity and fulness of our love for the Person of Jesus. To be "with Him" makes the preacher evermore a student, and always a student of the highest and best. The effective antidote against intellectual stagnation is abiding fellowship with Jesus. The true goad to study is the Apostle's longing to "know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings." And in all this, since Jesus has declared, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," the twelve possessed no advantage not equally open to disciples still, with all it involves of inquiry, explanation, correction, and ever-expanding vision.'

Now take this from Professor George Jackson's *Reasonable Religion*. Dr. Jackson quotes from Forbes Robinson's *Letters to his Friends*: 'I have been reading out here two very different kinds of books. One is Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, the other Moody's *Life*, by his son. Wellhausen's book gives you in outline the position of modern advanced criticism of the Old Testament. I have never before studied the history from the critical point of view really seriously. The study has proved extraordinarily interesting, and I must say that in the main I agree thoroughly with Wellhausen's position. . . . Moody's *Life* stirs me up to realise more the worth of the individual, the surpassing value of man's moral and spiritual nature.'

Then Dr. Jackson comments: 'Wellhausen and Moody—that is a very suggestive collocation, and it is not too much to say that the power of the pulpit in the days that lie immediately ahead of us will depend in no small degree on our success in yoking together the forces respectively represented by the German scholar and the American evangelist. To have the scholar and the evangelist for ever working at cross purposes is to sterilise all the Church's best endeavour. The evangelist who is afraid of scholarship has only a maimed Gospel, which will only commend itself to maimed men. Scholarship without an evangel is as futile as the wheeling of swallows round the church steeple.'

Proverbs.

Under the title of *Wayside Sayings*, Selwyn Gurney Champion and Ethel Mavrogordato have issued a volume of Proverbs (Duckworth; 5s. net). 'In the preparation of the present collection of Proverbs,' they say, 'we have endeavoured to

accumulate only those sayings which are comparatively little known and which are in danger of falling into disuse. The more ordinary or commonplace proverbs have not been included.' And they say so most truly. Here are proverbs innumerable which you never heard or read before, and many of them are as pithy as prudent. The curious thing about proverbs is that there is no religion in them, and rarely even any idealism. They are of the earth earthy. As a guide of life they are utterly unreliable. Some of them have the cynical sordidness of Satan.

Our authors divide their proverbs into nationalities. Let us test them by a few examples:

English. 'There is but an hour a day between a good housewife and a bad.'

Irish. 'There is no overtaking the shot once fired.'

Scotch. 'Choose a good mother's daughter, though her father were the devil.'

American. 'There are two sides to every question—the wrong side and our side.'

Egyptian. 'A borrowed cloak does not keep one warm.'

Arabian. 'God bless him who pays visits—and short visits.'

Japanese. 'No standing in the world without stooping.'

Chinese. 'Forethought is easy, repentance is hard.'

Spanish. 'To steal the pig, and give away the feet for God's sake.'

A TEXT.

Job xxxiii. 15.

'The Hebrew writers had great respect for dreams. "In a dream," says the *Book of Job*, "in a vision of the night . . . then he openeth the ears of men, and sealeth their instruction.' The Greeks thought dreams a source of wisdom; Synesius in his *Treatise on Dreams* declares that attention to divination by dreams is good on moral grounds alone. Jonathan Edwards, who by the way was a typical mystic and seer, having trance-like states under the stress of religious feeling, especially in the presence of nature, says in his *Diary*: "I think it a very good way to examine dreams every morning when I awake; what are the nature, circumstances, principles, and ends of my imaginary actions and passions in them, to discern what are my chief inclinations, etc." Kant in his *Anthropology* thinks dreams of value "in laying bare for us our hidden dispositions, and revealing to us not what we are, but what we might have been if we had had a different education."

'These quotations represent the classical and older view. At present dreams are apt to be dismissed as trifles, or discussed as merely physiological or pathological. Unquestionably dreams may follow indigestion, but they have other bearings too; and it is well to heed Charles Lamb, who takes the older view. "Some people," he says, "have no good of their dreams. Like fast feeders, they gulp them too grossly, to taste them curiously. . . . We have too much respect for these spiritual communications to let them go so lightly. . . . They seem to us to have as much significance as our waking concerns; or rather to import us more nearly, as more nearly as approach by years to the shadowy world, whither we are hastening. . . . It is good to have friends at court. The abstracted media of dreams seem no ill introduction to that spiritual presence, upon which, in no long time, we expect to be thrown. . . . Therefore we cherish dreams. We try to spell in them the alphabet of the invisible world; and think we know already how it shall be with us."

'We may believe then, if we take this older view, that dreams not only reveal to us our own deeper character, but draw from these deeper sources moral wisdom, truth not ascertainable by our conscious waking minds, even truths touching the life of the spirit and immortality. But these are the truths which the poets and mystics are always seeking.

> Waking or asleep,
> They of death must deem
> Things more true and deep
> Than we mortals dream.'[1]

[1] F. C. Prescott, *The Poetic Mind*, p. 26 f.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

IN MEMORIAM

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

DIED 15TH OCTOBER 1922

THE proofs of this number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES were found lying upon Dr. Hastings' study table after God had 'laid His hand upon his heart and healed it for ever.' He leaves behind him a noble example of self-sacrificing work. A notable career has ended, and a wonderful record has closed. But his work will live after him. We cannot allow this issue to go to press without briefly expressing our deep affection for a beloved friend with whom we have been associated in all his work for so many years.

T. & T. CLARK.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'I WAS impressed with the grave necessity of demonstrating our will-to-peace as men demonstrated their will-to-war. The speeches made in our Conference, and still more the private conversations of the delegates, disclosed vast ranges of peace sentiment which never find expression. Behind Governments and politicians, behind diplomatists and militarists, there is a great silent world of men and women yearning for peace. Delegates from every land spoke about it. Dr. Deissmann said that the dumb masses in Germany were seeking for peace. Dr. Monod said that the French folk were wearily longing for peace—"the men in our universities as well as the peasants in our fields." Delegates from Greece said that their people were hungry for peace. Americans and Englishmen spoke of their nations' passion for peace. The peoples are not numb; they are only dumb. They do not lack heart, they are only in want of a voice. They cannot demonstrate their desires. They cannot speak so as to make Governments hear and heed. They need an organ of expression, and where can they find an organ except in the Church of the Living God? What is the Church for but to be a mouth for the dumb, an instrument to utter the silent yearnings of the purest and the best in every land? Has the Church of Christ the needful life and initiative? Has she the spirit of courage and venture? Or is she dumb because she is numb? Has she health and vigour enough to gather together all that is holy and wholesome in the world, and demonstrate it in an audible judgment which will be like a voice from the throne of God? Is the Church of Christ ready to organise the forces of redemption? "Like a mighty army moves the Church of God." Is that to be a radiant reality or only an idle dream?'

The man who writes so, and ends by asking that question, is a preacher, the Rev. J. H. JOWETT, D.D. It is by preaching first of all that his question is to be answered.

Dr. JOWETT has given in *The British Weekly* his impressions of the Conference held at Copenhagen. He had other impressions, but none that made so deep a mark as this. This is the subject that remained with him after the Conference was over. This is the subject that is with him still. And always the conclusion is that the great need of the

moment is instruction in the principles of peace, and that the pulpit is the place for it.

He quotes the words of two Prime Ministers. In conversation, soon after the Genoa Conference, Mr. Lloyd George 'declared his conviction that what was wanted in these Conferences was a different atmosphere, a more imperative sense of moral ideal, and a driving power which would give the moral ideal its rightful constraints and sovereignty.' And then he added: 'We have not had the requisite religious force behind us, and it is for the Churches to supply it.'

The other is the Prime Minister of Japan. 'The Premier of Japan is not a professing Christian, but this was his judgment as he reviewed the verbal decisions of the Conference: "We must now look to the leaders of religion."' 'What,' asks Dr. JOWETT, 'is the response of the leaders of religion to the Prime Ministers of Britain and Japan?' The leaders of religion are the ministers of the gospel throughout the world. Their response is to make Peace the chief topic of their preaching, and the chief concern of their prayer, throughout the coming winter.

Now it happens that, long before the Genoa and the Copenhagen Conferences were held, the conviction came to us that Peace must be preached beyond everything else, and a volume was prepared to serve as the basis of discourse. One of the volumes of the 'Great Christian Doctrine' series, it is nevertheless not at all theological but altogether practical. The whole Biblical doctrine of Peace is discussed in it—the Peace of God and the Peace of Christ, Peace with God, with Conscience, and with Men, and, above all, the question of Peace or War. A fresh exposition is given of the principles underlying the Sermon on the Mount, leading to an interpretation of the Non-resistance sentences. And at every step the truth is made clear and sent home by new and carefully chosen illustrations.

The Conference at Cambridge in 1921 of the Modernists has been the occasion of much spilling of ink, as the newspapers express it. Another fairly large volume is just out, its author the Rev. Arthur C. CHAMPNEYS, M.A., and its title *A Different Gospel* (Bell; 3s. 6d. net).

The ground is carefully covered, few spots in the Modernist feast being left unexposed. But the author will forgive us if we say that the single page preface is worth the whole book. The preface has been written by F. A. DIXEY, M.D., F.R.S., Fellow of Wadham College, and Curator of Hope Collections in the University of Oxford.

Dr. DIXEY sees that behind all the efforts of Modernism to offer us another gospel lies a fallacy. It is the fallacy that miracles do not occur. If the Modernist could believe in miracles he could accept Jesus Christ as He is offered to us in the Gospels. But he cannot believe in miracles.

Why not? Because the laws of nature are uniform and admit of no such interruption. That is the position in a sentence. That is the fundamental article of the Modernist creed. From that all the rest comes forth.

But in making that the fundamental article of their creed the Modernists are out of date. They are a whole generation too old. In the end of the nineteenth century it was possible to hold that the laws of nature are unalterable. It is not possible in the twentieth. It is known now that there are no such things as laws belonging to nature. These so-called laws are our own invention. They are for convenience of speech. And they mean no more than that the universe is a cosmos, an orderly system, which we can depend upon for the work we have to do.

To say that these laws admit of no interruption is to assume a knowledge of the universe which we do not possess. Says Dr. DIXEY: 'Natural science is perfectly justified in saying that many of the recorded occurrences in the New Testament cannot

be brought under the operation of any of the ascertained uniformities of natural process; but in order to meet these records with a blank denial, it is necessary to make the assumption that our knowledge of cause and effect, admittedly imperfect in the past, is at the present day complete and unalterable.'

And every new day offers new proof that it is not. Is telepathy a fact? Science cannot say yet. To-morrow it may be able to say. Hypnotism is a fact. Yesterday it was denied, and on this very ground that it contradicted the laws of nature.

What, then, are we to do with the miracles? We are to take them on their evidence, just as we take everything else. 'Whether they actually occur,' says Dr. DIXEY, 'is purely a matter of evidence.' And he adds this significant sentence: 'In considering the credibility of the witnesses of alleged miraculous events, it should be remembered that in the history of human experience it has frequently happened that phenomena have been observed which the then existing knowledge of natural "law" was unable to explain.'

In the year 1909 there was celebrated in Cambridge the centenary of the birth of Charles Darwin, and the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*. An invitation was addressed to the Catholic University of Louvain to send a representative. The University decided to accept the invitation, and sent Canon DORLODOT, D.D., D.Sc., the Director of its Geological Institute.

Canon DORLODOT went with a will. And enjoyed himself. Even yet he thrills with pleasure as he remembers the moment when his name was called by the Chancellor of Cambridge University. 'Each name was naturally greeted with applause; but the clapping was redoubled when the Registrar of the University announced "The delegate of the Catholic University of Louvain." The élite of English Catholics were equally pleased. I was informed that my address sounded just the right note in the opinion of all the Catholics present, and was subsequently given publicity in the *Tablet*.'

But very different was his reception when he returned to Belgium. In Catholic communities the name of Darwin is not held in honour. No proposal is ever likely to be made for his canonization. Have not his books been on the Index all these years? His *Origin of Species* is bad enough, but his *Descent of Man!* No Catholic can forget that Darwin is supposed to have held that man is descended from the monkey. Canon DORLODOT at a celebration of the centenary of the birth of Darwin? He might as well (as he now ruefully says) have celebrated a centenary of the birth of Luther.

So Canon DORLODOT called a 'Conference'—several 'Conferences'—and proceeded to answer for his presence in Cambridge. His answer has now been translated into English by the Rev. Ernest MESSENGER under the title of *Darwinism and Catholic Thought* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 6s. net).

What is it that hinders a Protestant from declaring his belief in Darwinism? Is there anything that hinders? That which stands in the Catholic's way is very definite and very dreadful. It is, first of all, Tradition; next, it is the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* of Pope Leo XIII.; and, finally, it is the Biblical Commission of Pius X. All these obstacles had to be overcome by Canon DORLODOT, and he overcame them all.

What is Darwinism? Canon DORLODOT sums it up in two propositions. First, 'the primary origin of living beings is the result of a special influence on the part of the Creator, who infused life into one or a few elementary organisms.' And next, 'these organisms, by evolving in the course of ages, have given rise to all the organic species which exist at the present time, as well as those which have come down to us only in the fossil state.'

Opposed to those two 'fairly moderate' pro-

positions there are extreme opinions, one on either side. There is 'the theory known as Absolute Evolution, and the theory known as Creationism or Fixism. The theory of Absolute Evolution denies the special intervention of God, even in the origin of life: it attributes the first origin of living beings to a natural evolution of inorganic matter, which became organised and ultimately living matter by the simple action of forces, or, better still, of powers inherent in matter, or which at least were inherent in it in days gone by. The Creationist theory, on the other hand, admits a special intervention of God at the beginning of each one of the groups which we now call species.'

Now if Canon DORLODOT had been an ordinary controversialist, he would have shown that the two extreme opinions are wrong, and the middle opinion right. But that was not his purpose. He himself is a believer in Absolute Evolution. He does not hold that God's hand is to be discovered anywhere in all the long line of evolution—not at the place where a new species is found, not even at the beginning where all the start was made. He had to persuade his Catholic hearers that Absolute Evolution is the Catholic doctrine. And he did it. Over Tradition, over the Papal Encyclical, over the Biblical Commission—he rode right over them all and came home triumphant.

His chief difficulty was with the six days of creation. He rejected with contempt the modern notion that the six days are six periods of time. Well, then, if they are six days they are six days, said Tradition, Encyclical, and Commission. Not so, said Canon DORLODOT, they are nothing. For first of all, 'we must reject *a priori* any interpretation which would make a text of Holy Writ a Divine instruction upon a subject belonging to the physical or natural sciences'—and of course he proved to his hearers that Tradition, Encyclical, and Commission were with him there. And in the next place, 'when the sacred writers describe natural objects, we must understand them sometimes in a figurative sense, and at other times we must simply bear in mind that they are speaking the language of the men of their time, language which corresponds more often to the sensible appearances than to the inmost nature of things'—and again he showed that he had all the authorities on his side. Then triumphantly: 'It is by means of these rules of interpretation that we must seek the explanation of the apparent contradictions between the language of Holy Scripture and that of modern science.' And his Catholic hearers had committed themselves to the statement that Genesis and Science are in contradiction, and that, when they are in contradiction, Genesis must go.

Within the domain of Biblical theology we do not see any book more frequently quoted by progressive scholars than Professor E. F. SCOTT's volume on the Fourth Gospel. The interpretation of that Gospel seems to have taken a new departure from it.

Professor SCOTT has now written another book. His mind has been drawn to *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Doctrine and Significance* (T. & T. Clark; 8s.). So are the minds of many scholars drawn to-day. It is a modern attraction. Last generation may be said to have discovered the Epistle to the Hebrews. This generation may obtain the credit of having interpreted it. After centuries of neglect, even of deliberate disregard, this great Epistle is at last coming to its own.

The disregard of the Epistle to the Hebrews was due to suspicion of its theology. For its theology is its own. It is neither Pauline nor Johannine, it is neither Petrine nor Jacobine. Now the attraction of Professor SCOTT's book on the Fourth Gospel lay most of all in the way it brought out the distinctiveness of the Johannine theology. It may therefore be expected that he will not miss the distinctiveness—he is almost prepared to call it the eccentricity—of the theology of this unique Epistle.

It is distinctive in its very conception of religion.

What is religion? The writer of the Epistle—by the way, Dr. Scott does not know his name, and does not care to know. 'The church,' he says, 'had many leaders and teachers, and among them men of conspicuous gifts, of whom no record has come to us. The writer of Hebrews, it is fairly certain, was one of those forgotten teachers, and the search for his name is labour wasted.'

The writer of the Epistle, whoever he was, or she, does not open his argument with a definition of religion, after the manner of a modern theologian. 'With abstract analysis of this kind ancient thought did not concern itself. Nevertheless there is everywhere present to his mind a definite idea of what religion means, and by this idea his whole argument is tacitly determined. It is summed up in the phrase which meets us continually in the Epistle—"to draw near to God."'

Now that conception of religion is not Pauline, nor is it Johannine. It is not the conception of the Synoptic Gospels. In the Synoptic teaching, 'Jesus seeks to awaken in men such a confidence in the heavenly Father that they draw near to Him—surrendering themselves, in joyful obedience, to His will. For Paul the one end of religion is fellowship with God; and in the love of Christ, from which nothing can separate us, he finds the assurance of this fellowship. A similar view is set forth in the Johannine writings, although the communion with God is there conceived in a more metaphysical fashion, as a participation in the divine nature. But in Hebrews we hear nothing of fellowship with God, much less of actual union with Him; for it is assumed that God must always remain apart, "the Majesty in the heavens." Our attitude, even when we draw nearest to the throne of grace, cannot be other than one of "reverence and godly fear." The approach to God in which religion consists, is regarded, in this Epistle, as an act of *worship*, and is described in the language of Old Testament ritual.'

Is it, then, taken over from the Old Testament? It is taken over with a difference. And the difference is vital. In the Old Testament God is the sovereign Lord, and the attitude of the worshipper is an attitude of awe and homage. Then this attitude passes into confidence, confidence that the worshipper, because he is a worshipper, has a right to God's protection. The Psalmists become aware 'that amidst all changes and troubles they have an ever-present help. They attain to a condition of soul in which there is no longer any thought of the benefits they may receive from God, since the approach to Him is itself the fulness of life and joy.'

'The writer of Hebrews sets out from this Old Testament conception of religion as worship. But where the Old Testament simply accepts the fact that in the approach to God we obtain the supreme blessing, he connects this fact with another, which to his mind explains it. By drawing near to God as His people we draw near, at the same time, to the heavenly world. Our lives are no longer bound up with the visible and changing things, but are firmly anchored to the eternal realities. These two ideas of access to God and access to the higher world are everywhere united in the Epistle, and are both included in the conception of worship. To come into God's presence is to pass through the veil—to rise out of the sphere of change and illusion and find our true home among the things that cannot be shaken.'

'From this it follows that worship does not consist in certain acts of homage, performed at stated intervals, but in the abiding condition of those whom God has accepted as His people. As Paul conceived of the Christian life as an uninterrupted fellowship with God in Christ, so this writer thinks of it as a continual act of worship. Through our great High Priest we have been enabled to draw near to God, and by so doing to identify ourselves with the higher world. Worship has its sign and outcome in that spirit of faith whereby we apprehend the things not seen.'

This conception of the unseen is a feature of the

Epistle to the Hebrews which is so pervasive and so fruitful that it alone gives the Epistle distinction. For it is not simply a realization, however vivid, of the future world. The contrast between the seen and the unseen is spatial rather than temporal. But neither is it spatial, if that word suggests the notion of locality. It may be that St. Paul could not think of 'the heavenlies' without the thought of a habitation in space. The writer of this Epistle is not embarrassed in that way. In the unseen, which is also the eternal, that which is imperfect here and now has become perfect. And that perfection is realized, not only in the Christian High Priest, but in Christians, in the very Christians whom the writer was acquainted with, and in the writer himself. For its attainment is through faith. And faith is the realization of the things which every worshipper of God hopes for; it is the present possession of the things that are unseen and eternal.

The enmity between Edom and Israel was of long standing and very bitter. It began, in folklore if not in fact, with a quarrel between Esau and Jacob in their mother's womb. The difference between the two, as they grew to manhood, was very marked both in body and in mind; and many stories were told, intensely interesting as we read them even now, of their rivalry. Strange to say, these stories, though coming to us from the Israelites, make Jacob the transgressor, with more than a taste of meanness, and Esau the sufferer, with more than a touch of magnanimity.

But historically the enmity took definite shape when the Israelites reached the borders of Edom on their way to Canaan. They asked permission to pass through the Edomite country and were refused. They never forgot that refusal. Other acts of hostility must have passed between them in the course of their history, for even the Philistines, with whom the Israelites waged a long conflict for their very existence, were never hated as the Edomites were. But the climax came when Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem and carried the Jews captive to Babylon. The Edomites assisted the Babylonians and urged them to raze Jerusalem to the ground. Then they stood by the way as the Israelites passed to the land of their captivity, rejoiced openly and insultingly over their calamity, and caught and killed any one who attempted to escape.

The enmity was of long standing. Amos says: 'His anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever.' But the last act was beyond forgiveness. On the Edomites falls the only curse in all the prophecies of Jeremiah. Against the Edomites Ezekiel utters the fiercest of his threats. The Book of Obadiah is nothing but a prophecy of the doom prepared for the hated nation. The poet of Ps 137 united the Babylonian tyrant and the Edomite traitor in one imprecation, so terrible in its vindictiveness that we shudder as we repeat it now. But the most awe-inspiring of all the prophecies or poems is the vision which Isaiah saw, of the avenger of Israel's wrongs returning from the slaughter of the Edomites, and boasting that he had trod them in his anger and trampled them in his fury and that their blood had stained his raiment.

The passage is Is 63^{1-6}. It is the passage appointed to be read for the Epistle in the morning's service of Monday in Holy Week. What can a preacher do with it? For its meaning is unmistakable. Isaiah sees in vision a warrior, haughty and remorseless, returning from the slaughter of the Edomites. He is the avenger of Israel's wrongs. He boasts that he has trodden them in his anger and trampled them in his fury. The prophet asks the meaning of his dyed garments and his glorious apparel. The raiment is dyed with the Edomites' blood. There is no thought of concealment. 'Their life-blood has been sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment.' It is a vision of utter and unrelenting vengeance. What is the preacher to do with it?

He may preach the gospel of the grace of God with it. For out of it come two great principles of God's

working in the world, the two principles that explain all the anomalies of the world and vindicate the ways of God with men.

The first principle is this: *Every wrong that has ever been done upon earth shall be righted.*

Isaiah saw that. That is why he had this vision. All the prophets saw it. It is the faith that made them prophets. We bandy words about their foretelling, or their forth-telling, and we miss the very meaning of their existence. Their foretelling was forth-telling, and their forth-telling was foretelling always, for both were covered by their faith in God, the righteous God, the God who sees that righteousness is done. There were two facts which the prophets of Israel were sure of—one that God is absolutely just, the other that He is able to make His justice prevail. With these two facts they interpreted every event as it occurred, saw into the future, and had boundless confidence in God.

The Lord executeth righteous acts,
And judgments for all that are oppressed.
He made known his ways unto Moses,
His doings unto the children of Israel.

He made known His ways and His doings by the mouth of His servants the prophets. In prophetic vision Isaiah saw Israel's avenger return from the destruction of the Edomites, when no such destruction had yet taken place, because he knew that every wrong done under heaven is righted.

It was a great discovery. Have we made it? Have we even accepted it from the Hebrew prophet? Who can believe that we have accepted it who remembers the things which were said when the War began? Either God is not just or He has not the power to make His justice prevail—those were the things that were said. And they are said to this day. The end of the War, though it was in power and righteousness, did by no means bring us belief in the righteousness and the power of God. The popular belief at the moment seems to be that God is well-meaning but weak. Let us get back to the prophets. Let us get back to St. Paul. 'God is not mocked,' said St. Paul, 'for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap'—there is His righteousness. And again: 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God'—there is His power. We laugh now at Browning's

God's in His heaven,
All's right with the world.

But that is the very discovery that gives the Hebrew prophets their unique place in the history of the world.

The second principle is this: The wrong is righted, *not by the suffering of the wrong-doer, but of the wronged.*

Did Isaiah see that? The conqueror in Isaiah's vision returned from Edom with the blood of the Edomites sprinkled on his garments. But in the vision of Christ the conqueror returns and the blood that stains his raiment is his own blood.

'If a man smite thee on the right cheek,' what then? There are three ways of it. 'I will smite him back'—that is one way. That is the pre-prophetic way. 'God will smite him'—that is another way. That is the prophetic way. The third way is 'Turn to him the other also.' That is Christ's way.

Which of the ways is likely to prevail? The pre-prophetic way has been tried from the beginning; has it ever won? It is the way that is tried by most men and nations still: is there any sign of its winning? The second way, the prophetic way, is right, but it needs interpretation. It *is* God's way; but not as Isaiah understood it. The only way that has won and will win is the way of Christ.

When the Boxer riots took place in China an expedition was sent to punish the Chinese. The great nations of Europe were represented in the army; a German general was in command. The Missionaries protested against it. They wanted no revenge. The Kaiser gave orders to his general

that no mercy was to be shown. Which way is the winning way, the Kaiser's or the Missionaries'?

The Israelites themselves found the winning way. They found it when they became followers of Christ. Until Christ came there was no forgiveness for the Edomites. The Romans sent an Edomite to rule in Judea, and Herod the Great did all that man could do to conciliate the Jews. He married a daughter of their race. He built a Temple—for magnificence the wonder of the world. But they hated him still, and all the Herods that came after him. Then one of these Jews, exiled to the isle that is called Patmos, had a vision. It was a vision of vengeance over the Edomites, like Isaiah's. But in place of the proud conqueror, his raiment stained with the life-blood of his enemies, what John saw was a lamb as it had been slain.

When is this victory won? It is won when the wrong-doer sees himself in the wronged.

The ranks are crowded tier on tier,
  And midst them in my place am I,
As oft before; we talk and jeer,
  Waiting to see yon captive die,
Who in the arena stands alone;
  He turns his face—I see my own!

'Tis I that wait the roar and rush
  When bars are raised; 'tis I that fall
Upon my knees, amid the hush
  Of cruel tongues, on Christ to call;
Upon whose parted lips the while
  There breaks a glad triumphant smile.

So it was with Saul of Tarsus. First came Jesus and identified Himself with those to whom Saul was doing wrong. 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' And then Saul identified himself with Jesus, 'I am crucified with Christ.' The victory was complete.

George Adam Smith.

By William L. Davidson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Aberdeen.

It is a great thing for any University to have as its head a man of learning whose fame as a scholar is widely known throughout the world. Aberdeen University is specially favoured in this respect in its Principal and Vice-Chancellor, Sir George Adam Smith, whose writings in Biblical Criticism are standard works in America as well as throughout Europe. His exhaustive treatise on Isaiah attracted many of us years ago when it first made its appearance, while he was minister of what was then Queen's Cross Free Church, Aberdeen, and the outstanding preacher of the day. Not only lucidity of style, mastery of thought, and critical acumen distinguish this solid and inspiring work, but also rare open-mindedness and liberality of view.

The personality of Sir George Adam Smith is a very complex one, and it is not easy to do justice to the characterization of it. What attracts the attention of one who first comes in contact with him is his geniality and alertness, and his keen interest in any subject that may be brought before him for consideration. He is essentially an active man, alive at every point, in mind and in body, and not sparing himself when duty calls or help has to be given. His range of intellectual interest is practically unbounded. And, as the width of his sympathy is great, so also is the range of his acquirements. As a scholar, he occupies a front position in Hebrew learning, with which we naturally associate his name, and to which his students of former years in the United Free College of Glasgow bear grateful witness; but he is also a distinguished classicist, and has wide sympathy with philosophy and cognate studies. Of his many published works, two have long ago attained the position of classics—*The Book of Isaiah* (in two volumes), and *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, the latter of which achieved a new edition every year for seven years after its publication in 1901. To these must be added his *Deuteronomy* (1918), and *The Early Poetry of Israel*, which reproduces the substance of his

course of 'Schweich Lectures,' delivered in London before the British Academy in 1910, and deals with the vastly interesting topics of 'Language, Structure, and Rhythms,' to which Lecture I. is devoted; and 'Substance and Spirit,' overtaken by Lectures II. and III. Few lectures could be more valuable for the student of the Old Testament, more especially Lecture III., with its exceptionally fine rendering into English of poetical passages from the Hebrew.

As a preacher, the Principal is distinguished by extraordinary clearness of utterance, aided by distinct vocal enunciation and a pleasing, well-regulated voice. He is eloquent and inspiring to a degree, and always intense. He is at his best when he officiates in the University College Chapel, especially when his theme is from one of the Old Testament prophets, when his own masterly rendering of the passage selected, read out with proper emphasis and feeling, throws a flood of light on the prophet's meaning and brings out the sense in a way that almost dispenses with commentary or detailed exposition. He is powerful as an orator, in the best sense of the term (to be judged, say, by his memorable addresses to the General Assembly of his Church when he occupied the Moderatorial Chair); and his popularity is owing, not only to the worth and striking character of his thought, but also to the whole-hearted way in which he throws himself into the subject handled. In addressing a public meeting, he at once rivets the attention of the audience and creates a sympathetic atmosphere which he utilizes with great adroitness. For, behind all, lies the feeling on the part of the hearers that they are in the hands of a master of his subject, speaking out of personal conviction. Hence the desire of those engaged in furthering any worthy object to secure the Principal to advocate their cause. With him as speaker, success is assured.

The Principal is a *persona grata* with all classes of the community—not least with the Lord Provost and members of the Town Council. This is a great asset to the University; for to it, in no small degree, is owing the good and friendly relationship that exists between the University and the City of Aberdeen—between Town and Gown, manifesting itself in generous support extended by the civic community, when need arises.

It is as head of the University, of course, that the Principal's full strength appears. Wise, tactful, alert, ever zealous for the welfare of the great Institution over which he presides, he is effective alike as a counsellor and as an administrator. He keeps himself fully abreast of the learning of the time, and is keenly interested in every branch of it. Dealing, as he has to do, with a number of University 'Faculties' (Arts, Science, Divinity, Law, and Medicine), he has the gift of being able to make the interest of each his own, and never fails to lend a sympathetic ear to aspirations and requirements in every one of the departments and a helping hand towards progress and the removal of obstacles that block the way. He is guided by ideals, but his ideals are always made to keep in view their realization in actuality. Hence his value as counsellor in cases of doubt or difficulty. In any matter that requires delicate handling, he excels. In initiating plans and carrying out projects, whatever the time and the toil demanded, he is indefatigable. At the thought of his multifarious duties and busy life, one often wonders where the season of rest comes in. In days gone by, the Principal of a Scottish University was simply the figure-head, occupying very much the position of *otium cum dignitate*; but to-day he is perhaps the hardest-worked man in the Institution. The calls upon him are never-ceasing. This is inevitable, but also gratifying, for it is owing to the continual growth and progress of the University and the constant need of adjustment to fresh requirements and new situations, showing that the University is a living organism, and not a dead thing.

During the war, the Principal's tireless energy and outstanding capacity found striking illustration. At a critical and anxious moment, when our country was eager to rivet the friendship and secure the practical help of America, the Principal, who had made his name in former years in America by a series of University lectures there, was sent forth to the States, with the sanction of Aberdeen University, on a great mission of enlightenment, and for six months did yeoman's work in powerfully expounding to the Americans the true attitude and aims of Great Britain and in removing misunderstandings. His success was immense, as has been abundantly testified by Americans themselves; and for this the country owes him a great debt of gratitude.

In the University Court and the Senatus alike, the Principal is held in the highest esteem; and in both bodies his influence is deservedly great. He is an ideal chairman, making himself fully

conversant beforehand with all the matters that come up for discussion and decision—clear and definite in his opinions, fair in his judgments, and tolerant of those who may differ from him. His tact also and his sympathetic nature make him an ideal Chairman of the General Council of the University, securing to a remarkable degree the smooth working of that complex and fluctuating body.

His influence with the students of the University and his power over them is exceptionally great, arising from the fact that he identifies himself with student interests and keeps in general touch with the students themselves, attracting them by his uniformly frank and cheerful nature, his accessibility, and his sympathy with the social side of student life, as well as with student work and aspirations. He is the students' friend, and they know it.

A leading characteristic of the Principal is his power of making friends. His own distinctively social nature demands this, and a friendship formed by him lasts. He is an optimist, and optimism is infectious, and thereby life is made worth living.

This sketch would not be complete without a separate reference to the Principal's social qualities. These are altogether exceptional, for he is by his very nature 'one who loves his fellowmen,' and they adorn not only the gracious hospitality of his home, but also his public life. This makes him a very notable representative of the University on great occasions.

The Epistle to the Hebrews once more.

By Professor J. Vernon Bartlet, D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

My friend Professor C. J. Cadoux has raised afresh, in the September number, the problem of the historical setting of the 'Epistle to Hebrews.' It is one that has long had attractions for me, and I have at various times during the last twenty years made attempts to solve it. Each time I have had to set aside one element or another in my theory which seemed no longer tenable; but each time I felt more assured that, while I was departing more and more from the traditional view as to the body of readers addressed and the occasion and date of this 'word of exhortation' (13^{22}), I was getting nearer to the full and exact truth of the matter; for each time the theory fitted more easily into a large complex of converging indications. In the hope, then, that I may be able to carry the readers of The Expository Times, and perhaps Professor Cadoux himself, somewhat nearer to the final solution than they have hitherto felt themselves to be, I take leave to sketch briefly the line of my approach and the point reached up to date. In so doing, I can shorten my story by mostly taking for granted the large area in which we are at one, and dwelling only on the matters as to which our results diverge.

Originally,[1] then, I envisaged the situation in terms of the conclusions reached by A. B. Bruce and Dr. Hort touching the 'pull' of ancestral Judaism as at the root of the readers' tendency to 'drift away' or 'draw back' from living 'faith' in Jesus as 'the Christ,' under the pressure of a special menace of persecution. In their well-grounded resistance to the bias, then first developing, towards what Westcott rightly called the 'ingenious paradox' that the readers were Gentiles, those scholars were supported also by G. Milligan and A. S. Peake, in recent studies of the Epistle, though the two latter inclined to the newer view that they were a section of the Church in Rome. But I could not follow even Hort in holding that they were located in Jerusalem and Judæa. I tried, therefore, to find a suitable Jewish-Christian community living under the shadow of the impressive influence of the living forms of 'priesthood, sacrifices, ancient covenant, commonwealth' (Hort), yet in an Hellenistic, not a Hebrew environment; and sought it in Cæsarea, or rather in Judæo-Christian communities outside Judæa, 'of which Cæsarea may be taken as type,' at the critical season following on the martyrdom of James, the Lord's brother, in A.D. 61–62. As to authorship, I tried to follow the earliest tradition, to see if it would satisfy the conditions thus conceived; and this led me, like Dr. Cadoux, to examine 'the early and definite external evidence to the effect that the author was Barnabas.' But, after all, the earliest witness to such a tradition is Tertullian, some 150 years

[1] *Expositor*, June 1902 and November 1903.

after the Epistle was written; and it was purely a Western tradition,[1] and as such the less entitled to credence as of really historical value for a writing addressed to some circle in the East. Further, the reference to 'our brother Timothy,' at its close, did not suit very well the authorship of Barnabas, who had no known personal relations with this member of Paul's entourage from the date of his second missionary journey onwards.

These points tell against Barnabas as author. Further, I soon began to see that the references to priesthood and sacrifice were not in terms of the contemporary Temple at Jerusalem, but of the Mosaic Tabernacle as described in the Pentateuch. This removed any presumption in favour of a community such as Cæsarea, on account of propinquity to Jerusalem, rather than merely 'some community of the Dispersion in the East . . . with a Hellenistic type of Judaism' (A. B. Davidson, *Comm.* p. 18). But before these fresh considerations had told effectively on my thought, others had done so, and led to a modification of the above theory in the way of further definition of the first readers in relation to their immediate Christian environment.[2] Starting from the strange wording of the final salutation, 'Salute *all* your leaders and *all* the saints,' one asked, 'Why this reiterated emphasis on "all," unless a section only of the community is being addressed?' Westcott, in agreement with the patristic commentators, had observed that the special salutation of the leaders here enjoined 'implies that the letter was not addressed officially to the Church, but to some section of it.' Indeed, we may say that its author's aim was to bring a certain section or group into line with the views and practice of the local leaders (ἡγούμενοι), and of that part of the Church which followed them loyally. Thus the readers originally in view were a special group of conservative Judæo-Christians, homogeneous not only in type of piety but also apparently in their other conditions (*e.g.* a culture fitting them to be 'teachers,' after so long a lapse of time, 5^{12}, and possessions, 6^{11}, $10^{32ff.}$; cf. $13^{5f.}$). Thus they were inclined to stand apart from the local body of 'the saints' and their leaders, especially now that persecution was recurring; and in this connexion their non-committal or disloyal attitude as Christians, rooted in their lack of insight into the real meaning of true 'faith' in Jesus as the Christ, seems to have led some of them to absent themselves even from meeting together themselves for distinctively Christian fellowship (10^{25}). They were in fact the circle which felt to the greatest degree the influences making for worldly prudence and the line of least resistance at a time when 'faith,' as a positive and energetic loyalty to 'the living God' finally revealed in Jesus as His Messianic Son, was most called for by the crisis of the hour, which seems to have developed so suddenly as to force the writer to send his 'word of exhortation' before him from Italy, though he was himself shortly to sail; nay, he seems to be detained only until he can learn whether 'our brother Timothy' may not be able to join him ($13^{19.\,23}$), after release from captivity. 'In a word, the circle of readers addressed in the high argument of this great appeal, was the social and intellectual aristocracy of the Jewish Christians' in the local body of Christians generally. 'The moral influence of their example would be enormous. . . . A body of natural leaders of opinion must be kept from "falling away," if any effort on the part of their distant friend and teacher can avail by any means. To this end he adds the cheering news that Timothy, a name probably loved and respected' among them, 'had just been acquitted of the charge which had brought Paul to death—so that their enemies were not all-powerful, after all.'

Such a view casts light also 'upon the lack of opening address to the Epistle as we have it.' 'Here two alternatives present themselves. The writing may never have had any such address, as distinct from a mere direction on the outside. But the more probable view is that there was once the usual address ending with χαίρειν, prefixed to the splendid opening, Πολυμερῶς κ.τ.λ. "To . . . and the church in his house, greeting," so it may have run. Such an address, *from its particular and restricted nature*,—so unlike the general character of the argument, which made the Epistle singularly fitted for far wider use than that originally contemplated,—would tend to fall away directly the work began to be copied for the benefit of others.' In its place the mere descriptive designation 'To Hebrews' (*i.e.* Jewish Christians, as distinct from Christians as such)

[1] Dr. Cadoux says that 'in one passage' Origen 'quotes He 13^{15} as a word of Barnabas.' But the *Tractatus* to which he here alludes are now known to be the work of Gregory of Elvira in Spain, in the latter part of the fourth century.

[2] *Expositor*, June 1905, pp. 431–440.

would naturally arise. . . . The point may be illustrated from the partly analogous, and partly contrasted, case of the Epistle to the Romans. For there is a good deal of evidence, going back as far as Origen, which shows that 'there were in circulation in ancient times a few copies of the Epistle from which all local references had been removed.'[1] Both Epistles became 'general' in form, as they were in substance. But whereas in the case of Romans there were from the first copies which preserved the original address, and a great church identified with the latter by its living tradition, in the 'Epistle of Hebrews' it was otherwise on our theory.

But thus far this theory was still conceived in terms of Cæsarea, as the sort of locality in which the special house-church was to be sought, and of Barnabas as author. Between 1905 and 1910, however, these two ill-grounded assumptions had, for reasons already indicated, fallen away,[2] and the solution which still seems to me to meet the case in all respects had worked itself out in my mind. This may be seen stated yet more recently and briefly in 'The Riddle of the Epistle to the Hebrews,' in the *Expositor* for 1913, i. 548–551. In substance the fresh features are as follows. The approach to the secret of the riddle is found in the reference to Timothy as having just been set at liberty, and as possibly soon to join the writer himself; and the links in the argument are these. Timothy, as Dr. Cadoux also argues, had become involved in Paul's case at its latest stage (cf. 2 Ti $4^{9ff.}$). This fixes the date of his liberation as soon after the latter's death, which fell probably soon after the 'two whole years' of Ac 28^{30}, *i.e.* about spring or summer of A.D. 61 or 62. The judicial execution of the typical Christian missionary meant (as I believe) that his appeal from the charges brought against him, in which Jews of the Roman province of Asia took the lead (Ac 21^{27}, 2 Ti $4^{14f.}$; for Alexander the coppersmith of Ephesus as probably active against Paul before Nero's Appeal Court, cf. Ac 19^{33}), had failed, and Rome now seemed officially to treat Christianity as dangerous to law and order. This would produce a profound impression wherever the case was known, and nowhere so much as in the Roman 'Asia,' and Ephesus its capital, where Paul had lived and worked up to within less than half a year of his arrest in Jerusalem. In Ephesus it would tend to create a sudden crisis,[3] due especially to the handle thus given to Jewish enmity, and that particularly in the Christian circle nearest in standpoint to Jewish piety and farthest from the Pauline gospel, and so least ready to show its distinctive Christian colours—the full theoretic justification of which it but feebly realized. When news of the critical situation for Christian faith in this special group reached Italy, it would naturally occasion such a 'word of exhortation' as our 'Epistle to Hebrews,' if there was within the circle of Paul's fellow-workers there gathered a teacher of prophetic gifts adequate to rise to the new situation, and produce a fresh *apologia* for the finality of the gospel of Jesus as compared even with Judaism in its most authoritative form, that of the Mosaic ideal of religious access to God in the worship of the divinely enjoined Tabernacle service.

But who of Paul's associates known to us as connected with Ephesus was adequate to such a task? There is but one answer possible, Apollos, as described in Ac $18^{24ff.}$, 1 Co 1^{12}–4^{6}. He, too, in contrast to Barnabas, meets the conditions of close association with Timothy, both being fellow-workers of Paul in Ephesus. That Apollos had been with Paul at an earlier stage in his captivity in Rome is shown from Tit 3^{13}, where also he is referred to in such terms that it is natural to imagine him as on his way eastwards, *via* Crete, in order to get rebutting evidence against the local charges brought by 'Jews from Asia,' and presumably to return in due course with it.[4] Thus we can easily picture him after Paul's death writing *c.* 61–62,[5] say from Brindisi (note the salutations are from 'those of Italy,' not 'of Rome')—where he was awaiting Timothy after his release in Rome—this great 'word of exhortation' to a special group of wavering Jewish Christians in Ephesus, with whom he probably would have had personal relations, even as Timothy had had (cf. 1 Ti $1^{3ff.}$ for the dangers of a Judaizing type of local Christianity in Ephesus).

[1] Sanday and Headlam, on Ro 1^{7}.

[2] See art. 'Hebrews, Epistle to,' in the last edition of *Ency. Brit.*

[3] Christians at Ephesus had also undergone, soon after they 'were enlightened' ($10^{32ff.}$), a season of persecution, as we see from Ac 19 and 2 Co 1^{8-11}.

[4] On the other hand, there is no known likelihood of Barnabas going to Rome.

[5] Any affinity between Hebrews and 1 Peter, written *c.* A.D. 63, seems most easily explained by the latter's dependence on the former's fuller handling of the points in common; *e.g.* He 10^{22} and 1 P 1^{2}.

Apollos satisfies all the 'Alexandrinism,' as a mode of thought, that marks the high argument, without any need of looking to Alexandria as the home of its first readers; and at the same time we are able thus to fit the Epistle into the context of a definite historic situation by aid of its precious closing personal references. This result seems valuable as 'linking up' certain data of the Apostolic Age which hitherto have had to be read out of relation to their historic relations and setting, and thereby to add appreciably to their coherence and significance. If this synthesis is really a recovery of the facts of history, then it will afford a fresh fixed centre of light and further inferences, some of which may help to fix or illuminate other points still in relative obscurity. Further, I have put my contribution into the form of the story of its genesis, by a process of gradual advance through elimination of false assumptions and bringing into reckoning fresh considerations (present on the surface of the Epistle itself, yet not utilized in the right way by the constructive imagination), in order to suggest by an object-lesson how much room there still is for hope that the Apostolic Age will yield up many more of its secrets. For the written deposit of *real* human *life* does not lead students nowhere, or into wilds of mere guesswork, if only they keep their minds open to learn and unlearn, and follow confidently, step by step, whither all the indications taken together may by convergent testimony lead them. In the text of the New Testament there is, I am persuaded, none of the duplicity which deliberately covers up its tracks from the eye of later times. Similarly, the historian in his efforts to interpret the life-record of the Apostolic Age can do nothing in the long run against the truth, but only with and for it.

Literature.

FREEDOM OR NATURAL LAW.

Is there such a thing as moral freedom, or are we all under the tyranny of natural law? That is the question which Mr. B. M. Laing, Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Sheffield, sets out to answer in his book, *A Study in Moral Problems* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). Others have set out to answer it before him, and of that he is well aware. But all the problems in philosophy, as in religion, that are not yet solved have to be discussed by every generation as it comes. And Mr. Laing believes that every generation ought to be able to do something towards solving those problems, even those that never will be finally disposed of.

In any case, this is the business of an ethical teacher at the present time. It is not the discussion of metaphysics; it is the inductive inquiry into the facts or fancies of the moral life. The War has set men on the solid ground of reality, or at least men think so. They want truths to live by, facts to stake their future on. And so Mr. Laing, himself an *M.C.*, sets out, with hope in his heart and a determined eyebrow, to find whether or not we are responsible for what we say and do.

He does not prove we are, but he makes it very probable. Clearly he has himself become convinced that 'God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap'—a saying which is either silly or blasphemous if there is no freedom to will or to do. He does not prove it to those who have not the ear to hear. But to most of us his arguments are good enough. They at least make us feel about morality and the keeping of the law what Carlyle said about Margaret Fuller when he was told that she had decided to accept the Universe: 'Gad! she'd better.'

AN ARISTOCRAT.

Lord Ernest Hamilton, thirteenth child of the Duke of Abercorn, has written his reminiscences. The title, *Forty Years On* (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net), tells us at once that he was educated at Harrow. He gives the story of the making of the song. 'John Farmer had been at work on a new school song with which he was much in love. The moment the last new boy had been dismissed, he turned to the piano with an air of suppressed but ill-concealed excitement and said: "Now I've got something new for you which I want you to

learn. You can learn the tune first and then we'll get the words printed for you. I'll sing it through to you." He struck a single chord, which at that time meant nothing to us, but which to-day brings every Harrovian to his feet as surely as the opening notes of the National Anthem. And then, in his rich baritone voice, he sang :

"Forty years on, when afar and asunder
Parted are those who are singing to-day,
When we look back and forgetfully wonder
What we were like in our work and our play,
Then it may be there will often come o'er you
Glimpses of notes like the catch of a song,
Visions of boyhood will float then before you,
Echoes of dreamland shall bear them along."

'I am thankful to say that the first verdict of the school was unanimous. The song was good. We only carried away with us fragments of tune and scraps of the words, but we were distinctly pleased with John Farmer's latest effort. It was characteristic of boys that we gave no credit to Edward Bowen for the composition of the words ; the tune was all we bothered about.'

It is the autobiography of an aristocrat. The *Family Herald* reader will revel in it. For rarely (and then only for the fun of the contrast) does a commoner appear on the stage. There is much about hunting and shooting and racing and gambling. Great 'bags' are boasted of, as if that were the purpose for which God sent grouse and men into the world.

But there is nothing unclean in the book. From first to last it describes a life that is wholesome if not high. There may have been evil spots in the society of those forty years, but the Hamilton family kept themselves clear of them. Domestic happiness is the invariable outcome of marriage, and it is described in this book simply and sincerely. Large families were the rule—ten children the *average*—and as you turn these guiltless pages there is ever the sight of happy boys and girls, and not less happy parents. Lord Ernest Hamilton is firmly convinced that one man is made to rule, another to serve; no other thought has ever occurred to him. But he is just as sure that the man who rules must be manly.

This is a good example of his faith and also of his descriptive gift : 'The *Nereid*, in which we had made our never-to-be-forgotten trip up the coast, was a comfortable and confidential little boat, but as crazy as Bedlam among anything but Lilliputian waves. My father knew her for a bad sea-boat when he bought her, but, none the less, he determined, during our stay at Arisaig, to attempt in her the passage to the Hebrides across the Minch. This trip was destined to bring some of us very near the gates of heaven. We started in fair weather, but when about half-way across the Minch were met by a furious gale from the north-west. The waves ran mountains high, and it was clear that our only chance of ever seeing the Hebrides, or indeed any other land this side of Jordan, lay in keeping the *Nereid's* nose straight to the waves. For some little while after the bursting of the storm all went well, or, at any rate, nothing went very badly. Then, suddenly, to our horror, we saw the skipper, who had so far been at the wheel, fling himself down on his knees on the deck and commence an impassioned appeal to the Virgin, leaving the wheel to take care of itself and the nose of the vessel to do as it would. The *Nereid* was a small boat and it took my father but three strides to reach the derelict wheel and seize the spokes. For half a minute or so I believe it was touch and go with us, for the boat's bow had fallen perceptibly away from the waves and the lee gunwale was very near under water ; but after a few desperate and nerve-racking plunges, she came back to her true course and the imminence of the danger was past. The situation, however, was still sufficiently terrifying, for the *Nereid* had to stand almost on end to climb the giant waves that raced down on her, and when her nose plunged down on the far side, it seemed as though the next wave must inevitably overwhelm her. By this time the two members of the crew had joined the skipper in his impromptu service, and all three rolled about on their knees alternately howling and offering all sorts of strange bribes to the Virgin if she would come to their aid.

'Owing either to in-breeding, or the emigration of the fittest, or to the enervating climate in which they live, the natives of west Inverness-shire are a very inferior race to the Aberdonians or even to their brethren in eastern Inverness-shire. Round Arisaig they are almost exclusively Roman Catholics.

'To me, a small, drenched and inexperienced boy of fourteen, it seemed that afternoon that the end was only a matter of moments, for nothing is so infectious as panic, and there was ranting and perspiring panic on the deck at my very feet. But

terrified as I undoubtedly was (and I am not ashamed to own that I was terrified), I was not so terrified as not to be filled with pride at the sight of my magnificent father as he stood with quivering nostril and flashing eye, gripping in his muscular grasp the controlling spokes, the correct handling of which meant life or death to us. I remember thinking how like one of the Vikings of old he looked, with his erect head and his thick pointed beard flattened upon his chest by the gale.

'My father was physically one of the bravest men I have known. In face of most of the dangers that freeze other men's marrow he was utterly fearless. In two spots only was his nerve vulnerable, and they were two very ridiculous spots. He was terrified of a horse and terrified of a dog. But nothing else frightened him. On the occasion of our passage of the Minch, there can be no doubt that his nerve and promptitude saved the lives of all on board. Luckily the engineer, a Lowland Scot named Alison, also kept his head and his nerve, and these two between them pulled us through.'

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

There are three ways in which Religion appeals to us—as history, as philosophy, and as practice. For the greater number the only approach is in practice. And that is well, for without practice Religion is nothing. 'He that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not'—well, we know what becomes of him.

But the history and the philosophy of Religion are of interest and of use. We have to be able to give a reason to every man we meet of the hope that is in us, and especially to ourselves. Without some knowledge of the history of Religion we should be as those wonderful writers before the War who denied the very existence of Jesus. Without some knowledge of its philosophy we should see no reason why we might not worship stones and trees. Let us study the philosophy of Religion. Let us study it with the help of *A Student's Philosophy of Religion*, a handsome volume, written by William Kelley Wright, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Dartmouth College, U.S.A., and published in this country by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (20s. net).

It is a book for students. It is intended to make them study. It is not written to be undigestibly swallowed. If the student can criticise it, Dr. Wright will appreciate the criticism. There is, for example, the statement on page 210 of the indebtedness of Christianity to other philosophies and other religions: 'It can be frankly admitted that other religions have recognized a few values more adequately than Christianity has yet done. That has always been true of Christianity. From the very outset it has had to assimilate valuable features from other religions. It got most of its theological conceptions from Greek philosophy. In part it got its sacraments and much of its conception of divine communion from the ancient mystery religions.' That is probably untrue. All research goes now to prove that the Christianity contained in the New Testament owes nothing to either Greek philosophy or the mystery religions.

But from the estimate on a subsequent page of the finality of Christianity there will be little room for dissent:

'But is Christianity ultimately *true*? In a strictly metaphysical sense, the author supposes that it must be said that no religion can claim ultimate truth. All try to express by means of symbols what is infinite and unknowable, as well as what is knowable, but has not yet become scientific knowledge. But the symbols of Christianity have proved their adaptability to twenty centuries of more varying conditions than ever confronted any other religion (except the Jewish), and they have grown and become enriched in the process. It seems safe to conclude, therefore, that Christianity, which symbolizes more truth for more races and more environments than any other, is the closest approximation to absolute truth which can be attained by the mind of man through the instrumentality of a religion. With the experience of future ages Christianity will become further advanced. There may be greater changes in future doctrines, ritual, and ecclesiastical organization than even the past has known. We can feel sure that the revelation of God in the personality of Jesus Christ, with the ever-enlarging interpretations which the succeeding generations will continue to give to it, shall continue to be the means through which men will endeavour to secure the conservation of their socially recognized values.'

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

'This book is the result of a request made to me in 1911 by the late Professor Swete to continue his

work on the development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit which, as he remarked at the time and implied later in his preface to *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, he felt he would not live to undertake beyond the Age of the Fathers. Being engaged then in reading round the subject in the mediæval period, I consented to this request, little thinking that, owing to the comparative newness of the ground, it would involve a task covering the space of eleven years. Even so, this book makes no pretensions to being exhaustive, but simply seeks, by surveying the thousand years which separate the Ancient Church from the Modern, to show in as true a light as may be possible what is the foundation of modern thought concerning the Person and work of the Holy Spirit and His place in the Triune Life of God.'

With these words the Rev. Howard Watkin-Jones, M.A., offers us his book on *The Holy Spirit in the Mediæval Church* (Epworth Press; 12s. net)—a noble book, its subject, its scholarship, its very manufacture, and its pre-war price giving it clear distinction.

First of all there is a motto opposite the Contents page which deserves repetition. 'A man who does not know what has been thought by those who have gone before him is sure to set an undue value upon his own ideas.' So said Mark Pattison, and Lord Acton quoted him. Mr. Watkin-Jones quotes Lord Acton, and we quote Mr. Watkin-Jones. Now pass it on. For to the preacher beyond all others it needs to be preached. It is just because we set an undue value on our own ideas that our sermons are so doubtful and so dull. The preacher is as an autobiographer—all that touches himself is interesting to himself. But he has to find the things that touch others also, the universal things, the particular in the universal.

Now to the book.

Mr. Watkin-Jones describes each thinker's contribution within one period, and then passes to the next period and the thinkers in it. All the while, however, he is watching the development of thought and indicating its progress. Then when the end comes, he gathers his impressions together into short chapters on the Godhead of the Spirit, the Relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, the Personal Life of the Spirit, the Work of the Spirit in Creation, in Inspiration, in the Incarnation, the Mission of the Spirit, the Work of the Spirit in the Sacraments, in Justification and Sanctification, the Witness of the Spirit.

Those short chapters will be read first by many. But they are not the most valuable chapters. The strength of the book lies in the analysis of each thinker's contribution. Mr. Watkin-Jones confesses that he has spent eleven years on this study. No one will be surprised. He has read every author apparently for himself and with care. That takes time. And although he has the gift of separating the essential from the accidental, even the accidental has to be read and regarded.

The book worthily succeeds Dr. Swete's work.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

In spite of the number of commentaries on the Book of Job that have lately appeared, there is room and a welcome for the commentary of Moses Buttenwieser, Ph.D. Dr. Buttenwieser is Professor of Biblical Exegesis in Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. He has lectured on Job for many years, and he has a theory. He has tested his theory on the minds of his students, and it is by their encouragement that the volume now sees the light. Its title is simply *The Book of Job* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net).

His theory is that Job has been corrupted so extensively that an entire reconstruction is necessary of the whole great section from the 16th chapter to the 37th. He has accordingly reconstructed it, using all the versions for the purpose. In the course of his work he discovered, as he believes, that the greater part of chapters 34 to 36, assigned in our Bible to Elihu, belonged originally to Bildad. And to Bildad he has restored it.

The volume contains the Hebrew (reconstructed) text, a translation, full exegetical notes, and an introduction. More than that, it contains a thoroughly practical index, and a glossary of Hebrew words, idioms, and forms.

Dr. Buttenwieser rejects none of the Book of Job except the Elihu appendix, and that, as we have seen, he retains in large part by handing it over to Bildad. The date he takes to be about 400 B.C. His translation is singularly lucid and likely. Take the famous passage in the 19th chapter (19^{25-27}).

It is introduced in this way: 'The consolation that Job finds in the knowledge that his conscience is guiltless, and that he can face God without fear, grows soon into something far more positive. His earlier bewilderment vanishes, the feeling that God is bent on crushing him without reason or relenting

gives way to an ever-growing conviction that, in spite of what men would have him believe, God is really on his side and ultimately will champion his cause before the world. As this assurance reaches its height, it finds exultant expression in the famous outburst:

"But I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that at last He will appear on earth.
Even after my skin hath been torn from my flesh,
Still will I cherish the hope that I shall see God.
The heart in my bosom pineth
That I may see Him, a champion in my behalf,
That my eyes may see Him, and not as an enemy."'

Then he says: 'Into this classic passage the Occidental Church, following Origines, has read a belief in immortality and resurrection, an interpretation which not only has no basis in the passage itself, but which is, in fact, contradicted by the rest of the dramatic poem—by Job's emphatic denial of a life after death, $14^{11f.\ 14}$, and by the fact that no cognizance of such a hope is taken in the dénouement. It is for vindication in his lifetime, not after his death, that Job hopes. Not that he expects to be restored to health and prosperity—this he knows cannot be. He expresses the hope that God may reveal Himself to justify him and to attest to his innocence before all the world—a hope which is fulfilled in the dénouement.'

THE PSALMS AS LITURGIES.

Another volume by Professor John P. Peters has been published after his death. It contains the Paddock Lectures for 1920. And the strangest lectures. For after the first is over, the lectures consist of a translation of the Psalms, one by one—or rather two translations, that of the A.V. and a literal one by Dr. Peters himself—and a commentary. How did the students and others who usually attend the Paddock Lectures listen?

But the reading is easy enough and instructive. Dr. Peters holds that the Psalter is a collection of liturgical hymns or poems, written for use at the offering of sacrifice in the Temple, but containing also hymns for use on other occasions and for other purposes. Hence the title of his book: *The Psalms as Liturgies* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net).

Dr. Peters has not vexed his soul with textual emendation. He is not careful to detect minute flaws: he is not ambitious to make happy conjectures. His interest is really in the comparison between the Hebrew Psalms and the Babylonian. That is his field and he cultivates it to some purpose. Otherwise there is little that is new and nothing that is startling.

With one exception. The 91st Psalm he believes to be a charm against evil spirits. 'In general principle and idea,' he says, 'it is the same as some of the Babylonian charm liturgies which have come down to us, but it differs from these in its monotheism and its spirituality; in making the knowledge and love of God the charm to overcome the powers of evil. The similarity and difference are the same as between the cosmogony and mythology of the two peoples as represented in the Books of Genesis and the old Babylonian inscriptions. We have, it is true, at a later date, Jewish charms and incantations quite as gross, material, and polytheistic as the similar Babylonian charms and incantations, but there are none of those elements in this liturgy. Indeed so spiritual is its expression that the modern Christian can use it not only without offence, but with fullest sympathy and edification; and unless attention were especially called to it he would probably quite fail to perceive its original use and intent.'

THE LORD OF THOUGHT.

Miss Lily Dougall, the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, and the Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford, have together made a study of the problems which confronted Jesus Christ and the solutions He offered. The volume is published by the Student Christian Movement with the title *The Lord of Thought* (12s. 6d. net).

The thesis is set forth by Miss Dougall; it is established by Mr. Emmet. This is the thesis. Jesus was an intellectual giant, a genius, as Miss Dougall prefers to call Him—but she does not use capitals with the pronouns. Now, a genius is not likely to have made gross mistakes—in quoting Scripture, for example. Therefore if there are gross mistakes we are entitled to attribute them either to his immediate reporters or to subsequent speakers telling the story orally, or finally to interpolators. Take an example.

A clear example is found in Lk 7^{27}. There Jesus, quoting Malachi, is reported as saying: 'This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee.' Now in Malachi the passage reads: 'Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me.' It is God that speaks.

Who changed 'the way' into 'thy way,' and 'me' into 'thee'? Miss Dougall cannot believe that it was Jesus. For then either he misquoted 'Malachi out of ignorance—a mistake that the very bystanders would have detected; or he parodied Malachi to advance his own claims—an obviously absurd hypothesis; or the early compilers of Q put into his lips words he did not say; or the words of Q were altered to suit a later and mistaken tradition.' Miss Dougall assumes that Jesus quoted Malachi correctly, and believes that 'some tradition must have early altered the pronoun to make it appear that Jesus said that John was his forerunner.'

Mr. Emmet does not refer to this example. He works his corroboration in his own way. And a very capable way it is; not always convincing, certainly; but always fair and scholarly.

It is the eschatological element in the Gospels that troubles both, and both make an effort to eliminate it. Are they successful? Ask themselves and they will answer No. But they claim that much of its difficulty is removed in this way. And their claim is at least worth investigating.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMANISM.

Viscount Haldane is always up-to-date with his knowledge of philosophical thought, and when he writes he always contrives to add something new. His latest book, *The Philosophy of Humanism* (Murray; 12s. net), contains three Donnellan lectures, delivered at Trinity College, Dublin, on the philosophical significance of 'Humanism,' and three essays on the philosophical significance of other subjects, the other subjects being Mathematical Physics, Biology, and Psychology.

Of them all the most attractive topic for the moment is, of course, Psychology. And in Psychology the most attractive topic is the relation of the subconscious to the conscious self. On this Viscount Haldane has something to say.

'It is not clear that we can treat the conscious and the unconscious as separate entities. The methods which do so appear indeed to have more practical than scientific value. Within our experience the one shades off into the other. Much of our highest activity in reflection, in conduct, in art, is unconscious of itself. It is not on that account irrational nor does it belong to a different self. It is mind developing itself in its own activity. As has often been pointed out, by among others Professor Stout, psychologists are apt to ignore the constructive side of mental process even in its lower phases. When I have experienced in the past a particular sweet taste, in connection with a particular appearance of sugar, it does not follow that association means that the sense of sweetness associated with the appearance of another piece of sugar is the particular sweetness previously experienced. It is surely a new idea of sweetness connected with the appearance or conception of the present bit. A universal of reflection enters into the concrete individuality of the sugar as I conceive it. There is here a construction based on an inference from past experience which does not belong to direct awareness. There may be and are regions which have no counterpart in any actual experience. But when elements come from them into my awareness they come into the world of my conscious experience, and there attain reality. There is no other real world. There may be what is loosely called "double personality," two centres in the same individual from which memory is differently focussed. A line of demarcation between two series in experience may exist. But it is a shifting one, for otherwise there would be two individuals. What I am at the moment unconscious of is something beyond what I am actually aware of. But it falls within the identically same mental activity which I bring to bear on other experience, and it is in this respect at least continuous with it. The unconscious is therefore no world which is subsistent in itself and apart from me. Although outside my present experience it is continuous with it. For bare feeling by itself would be non-existent because meaningless. There can be no other world of bare feeling, and when the limits within which I am aware are extended they are so extended just by the increased scope of my recognition through concepts, and not merely by the intrusion of what has no actual existence apart from these concepts. The notion of an unconscious existence, a "subliminal self," to use the phrase of the late Frederic Myers, seems to be an hypothesis founded on a

metaphor which will not bear criticism. There is only one object world for the self, an object world which is always expanding or diminishing, but which owes its significance to the constructive activity of intelligence operating in universals. This is the fact from which we start in human intelligence, and the view which the evolution theory gives us does not contradict it. For that view, while true from its own standpoint, is only a relative one which does not explain the basic starting-point of the knowledge within which the object world it postulates has a place but only a place.'

That passage sufficiently shows the up-to-dateness of Viscount Haldane's mind, and its saneness.

A GREAT MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

From the Epworth Press comes the fourth volume of *The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Society*, by G. G. Findlay, D.D., and W. W. Holdsworth, M.A., B.D. (18s. net). Four great enterprises are covered by it. First of all, there is a history of the Women's Auxiliary; next, of the Missions in West Africa; then, of the work done in South Africa, the Transvaal, and Rhodesia; lastly, of the Wesleyan Missionary efforts on the Continent.

From beginning to end the interest is personal. There are heroic men and women—men like Thomas Birch Freeman and Henry J. Piggott, women like Mrs. Wiseman and Mrs. Everett Green—and the interest is deepest where they are at work. But in a sense every man and every woman engaged in this service is heroic—for it is the heroism of faith that sent them to it and kept them in it—and there is not a name of all the number but carries some thrill of admiration to the soul of the reader. The volume is an appendix to the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There the heroes and heroines of faith who preceded Christ on earth have their names and deeds recorded, here the heroes and heroines who followed after. But, with ampler space, the writers of this book can give names and notice acts which had to be passed over in the Epistle with a 'what more can I say, for time would fail me.' The wonder of the book is that there are so many, all issuing from one Church, all attached to one Society, who, by faith, when they were called, went out, as truly as Abraham, 'not knowing whither they went.' For which of all those who went to Sierra Leone, let us say, knew? And yet, had they known, would they have hesitated to go?

It is not a story of unfailing accomplishment. The heroic is not that of the world. It is that of the Kingdom. And very often the report is that no results whatever are visible. The summary of one of the chapters ends with that bitter word 'withdrawal.' For the Kingdom is as leaven which a woman took and *hid*. It works unseen for a long time in some 'measures of meal,' but it works always and everywhere. And this book has a long enough story to tell to let us see the working of it at last almost everywhere. Perhaps the hardest trial that faith had to accept was on the Continent of Europe. At any rate, there were elements in that trial unknown elsewhere—ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, selfishness—which were peculiarly difficult to bear and overcome.

One thing comes incidently from the book. It is the fact that the Empire as an empire owes much to the Wesleyan Missionary Society. In territory it owes, and we are 'imperialistic' enough to believe that even that is good. More, however, in the possibility of retaining and governing the territory gained. For this is the wonder of British supremacy, that it has so rarely had to give up what it once gained. It owes that to the presence and the work of the missionaries.

PROGRESS IN RELIGION.

Belief in God is belief in progress. Professor Bury believes in neither; Dr. T. R. Glover believes in both. Dr. Glover believes that it is possible to trace the path of progress in any stretch of history, or area of geography, if the materials are sufficient. They are sufficient in Europe, and especially round the Mediterranean, from the days of Herodotus to the days of Tacitus. And he has written a history of *Progress in Religion to the Christian Era* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net).

'My thesis is that a progress is to be observed in men's conceptions of Religion. We shall look to find it in the development of their sense of the value of the individual man, both as an agent and as a passive member of society, in virtue of his personality; and in connection with this, we shall find a progress in men's ideas of conduct both as regards the individual and society; their conduct will depend on their estimate of personality, and that, as already suggested, on their sense of personality

in their God. All his relations with men will be interpreted in the light of his personality and its bearing upon the personalities of men. The impulse to conceive in this way of the relations of God and man, we shall find, came partly along the lines of men's experience of common life and their slow discovery of the value and beauty of moral law, partly along the lines of reflection upon God. We shall find a steady drive to a morality that is ever higher, and a drive, as steady, toward monotheism, while religion ever claims more and more of life. We shall find that the soul refuses to be satisfied on any level but the very highest, and that, as a German thinker has said, "man is for nothing so grateful as for the advancement of his spiritual life." We shall find that man has a firm belief that nothing but the truth will help him, and an undying faith that he will find truth or that it will be revealed to him; and, in the end, that he and God stand face to face for eternity and can adjust their relations on no basis less than ultimate and perfect righteousness.'

There is optimism for you. But it is the optimism of the believer in Jesus. Dr. Glover stays his hand at the Coming of Christ, but he himself would never have been able to write, he would never have conceived the idea of writing, a history of the progress of finding God, if he had not been trained within the Church of Christ. 'Greek and Hebrew move toward the same goal, propelled by the same impulses.' They do, when you see that they do. Christ came that we might see. Yes, Dr. Glover is an optimist, a Christian optimist. 'The whole world, as Paul said, groans together in travail. The cost is great, as prophet and philosopher found; but what is once gained is never quite lost again. Slow and fluctuating, there is a progress in man's conceptions of God, and mankind moves forward with a surer hope of reaching Truth.'

He has most difficulty in seeing progress in apocalyptic. He has no great opinion of apocalyptic. 'It is more than possible that the significance of Apocalyptic is being exaggerated; Professor A. B. Bruce indeed held that "the great heart of humanity has only one duty to perform towards it, and that is to consign it to oblivion."'

So it does not matter quite so much as we have been told whether the Jewish apocalyptist was a backwater or not. Meantime Dr. Glover's wrestling with apocalyptic in his optimistic way is another evidence that just that part of the Gospels is at present the most perplexing part, and that we have not got the 'hang' of it yet.

Mr. Sidney Dark assures us that a new reading public is rising up among us. 'The mass of men lack vision. They are so concerned with their own material affairs that without help they have no inspiration, no understanding. It is the mission of the great writer to give them these things. They cannot be given unless there is the desire of the gift. I affirm that the desire exists. It exists in the sordid mining villages of South Wales. It exists in the mills of Lancashire and Yorkshire. It exists, to an amazing extent, among young men and women who work in London shops and offices.'

It is a form of socialism not yet taken much notice of. 'The new generation is resentful of monopoly and privilege, and while it is protesting against the finer material possessions of the world remaining in the hands of the minority it is also claiming, partly from curiosity, partly through class antagonism, partly from the yearning for a larger and fuller life, the enjoyment of that great national imaginative heritage to which, among other people, the son of a Stratford butcher, a Bedfordshire tinker, the son of a London ostler, and a man who spent his boyhood in a blacking factory, have made such splendid contributions.'

Mr. Dark's lecture on *The New Reading Public* has been published for 'The Society of Bookmen' by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (1s. net).

Said a woman worker recently: 'There is only one thing that children need to be taught—self-control.' With that Dr. Bernard Hollander agrees. From his psychological point of view there are three classes of people in the world, those that are good by nature, those that are bad by nature, and those (the vast majority) that are conscious of two tendencies within them and need to be taught self-control. His new book on *The Psychology of Misconduct, Vice, and Crime* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) is from first to last a homily on self-control. He is often consulted by the third class. The first do not need him; the second do not want him; but the third class often, he says, believe that a physician can do for them that which parent or teacher failed to do in early life. And he succeeds sometimes. His method is hypnotism. He does

not believe in suggestion, whether 'auto' or other. In hypnotism, courageously carried through, he has much faith.

He touches marriage and divorce. He would allow divorce somewhat easily. 'If either the man or the woman has made a serious mistake, matrimony is hell. There should be no law, human or divine, compelling people to live in a hell on earth. To compel them to do so is wrong, both to the individual and to society. It is in itself immoral, and leads to immorality outside the pale of matrimony. It may lead to murder and to suicide. It is bad for the children that grow up in a vicious home and have their training neglected.' But he admits there is another side. Perhaps the other side is stronger than he thinks. It is the same with divorce as with war:

> The sight of means to do ill deeds
> Makes ill deeds done.

Mr. William Murison, M.A., Senior English Master in the Aberdeen Grammar School, has edited for the Pitt Press Series *Sir Thomas Browne: Religio Medici* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 4s. 6d.).

And, first, it is up to date. 'In the spring of 1661, Browne had spoken, not without satisfaction, of Cromwell's head cut from his dead body. Three years earlier he had, in *Hydriotaphia*, expressed his horror of any interference with the dead; "to have," as he phrased it, "our sculs made drinking-bowls, and our bones turned into Pipes, to delight and sport our Enemies, are Tragical abominations." He himself was to suffer one of these "abominations." In 1840 his coffin was accidentally broken into. The sexton carried off the skull, and sold it. Later it was placed in the pathological museum of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital. Now, in 1922, we are glad to chronicle its restoration to its first resting-place.'

Next, it is precise and appropriate in illustration. One of the notes is on

'**subdivide and mince.** Here *mince* differs from *subdivide* in suggesting minute subdivision. An example of what Browne means is found in the history of the Church of Scotland. A secession took place, 1733–40, and this body split into two in 1747 on the question of the burgess oath. The two sections were popularly known as "Burghers" and "Anti-Burghers." Later on a second "dichotomy" occurred in regard to the province of the civil magistrate, and hence there arose in both original sections parties nicknamed "Old Lights" and "New Lights." It should be added that the two "New Light" parties united in 1820, and the two "Old Light" parties in 1842.'

Lastly, it is the work of an accomplished scholar, altogether at ease on familiar ground, and making his readers sharers of the joy he has in it.

We have had Shakespeare clubs and Browning societies in this country, but not yet classes for the minute and co-operative study of the English Bible. In America, however, the 'Discussion Group,' as it is called, is a great movement, and has already called forth a considerable literature to meet its needs. The latest, and the best we have seen, is an introduction to the teaching of our Lord. It is written by Mr. A. Wakefield Slaten, Head of the Department of Religion and Ethics in the Young Men's Christian Association College of Chicago. Deliberately prepared for the Study Groups, it is nevertheless a most readable book; and its originality of approach gives it an unusual interest. The title is *What Jesus Taught* (Chicago Univ. Press; $1.50).

The matters discussed are all matters of concern at the present moment, none of them more so than the matter of peace or war. It is evident that in the Study Groups as in the Pulpits this is to be the theme of most frequent discussion and exposition throughout the coming winter.

Dr. C. I. Scofield is the Editor of the Scofield Reference Bible. He is also a preacher. A volume of his sermons has been published at the Oxford University Press. The title is *In Many Pulpits* (12s. 6d. net). Under 'The Christian Year' one of the sermons will be found, slightly abbreviated, and from that sermon a good impression will be taken, we think, of Dr. Scofield's preaching power. It will be observed that unedifying questions are not raised nor even unnecessary exposition offered. The subject is introduced directly from the circumstances, and then, when the mind has settled down to listen, three lessons are suggested, each lesson in touch with life and captivating to the intellect. So is it always—though not always just three lessons. Dr. Sclater says that it is in the providence of God that sermons should be divided into three parts, and no one now rails against God's provi-

dence. But he does not mean that if you had two or four heads you would be displeasing to God.

It is a handsome volume, so printed as to be a great joy to the reader.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have issued the 101st volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (7s. 6d. net). Every volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* has its own features, though to the casual reader one may seem as like another as do the natives of an African village to the white man. The feature of this volume is the number of articles or addresses without texts. Does it mean that men are discarding texts? That has threatened to become a fashion again and again, but it has always perished with a few men's using. The text, the text's the thing, wherein you'll catch the conscience of the king—and of the peasant.

There is an interesting series of addresses on the Seven Words that deserve notice. For it is very hard to say anything fresh on the Seven Words. And among other notable things there is the record of a courageous effort on the part of Dr. Horton. He told his people at the beginning of the year that on the first Sunday of each month he would deal with some live topic; and he proceeded at once to handle a live enough topic—the hours of closing the public-houses. He pointed out that the London magistrates had decided to close them at ten o'clock, in all the parishes except four—Hampstead, Paddington, Hanover Square, and the Strand. And he called on his congregation to protest to the magistrates of Hampstead, where their church is. 'The facts are overwhelming. We know that the people are made to suffer simply and solely in the interests of a great trade; in fact, that is the argument—that £50,000,000 are involved in it, and to close the public-houses at 10 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock may imperil the dividends of those who invest in the drink traffic. It is a clear moral issue, and no unprejudiced person can miss the point that we have to save the people, especially the children, from this demoralisation.'

Note that Mr. Claude Houghton's drama *Judas* has reached a second edition (Daniel; 3s. 6d. net).

Laura H. Wild, B.D., Professor of Biblical History and Literature in Mount Holyoake College, has written *A Literary Guide to the Bible* (Doran; $2 net). The volume is further described as 'A Study of the Types of Literature Present in the Old and New Testaments.' But the two titles together give but a faint idea of the wealth of instruction to be found in the book.

The literature of the Bible is divided into eight great classes—Folklore, Story-telling, History, Poetry, Drama, Wisdom, Oratory, and Essay. Under each of these classes come varieties, all fully described and illustrated. And the illustrations are not from the Bible only, but also from the literature of other nations. Thus Flood-stories are quoted from Babylonia, Greece, India, Burma, Cochin China, Polynesia, British Columbia, and Scandinavia.

It is a book which would gratify the Royal Commission on Education if that august body were to hear of it, for it offers just that instruction in English which is commended in their Report. But more, it will educate old and young into an appreciation of what the Bible is written to accomplish—not the teaching of English but the bringing of men to God.

We must cast our net wide if we are to keep our children's sermons fresh. We should include in our reading the Rev. George McPherson Hunter's books. His latest volume is *Gardens of Green* (Doran; $1.25 net). If we may not preach the sermons themselves (and we may not), we may use the illustrations in them. The poetry also; and it is particularly good, as well as plentiful. Here is one of the poems. Its author is Mary Adair Macdonald:

(Frankincense, myrrh, and gold;
Winds His choristers, worlds about His knee . . .
Hath He room at all in His awful Treasury
For the gifts our Kings unfold
That can ne'er be told?)

This is the night of a Star.
This is the long road's ending.
They are sleeping now; they have brought their warrior best
To the Lord their God Who made them;
And lo! He hath repaid them
With rest.—

This is the night of a Star.
The laugh that rings through torment, the ready jest,

Valor and youth, lost hope, and a myriad dreams
Splendidly given—
He hath taken up to the inmost heart of Heaven,
And now—while the night grows cold, and the ward-fire gleams,
You may guess the tender smile, as He walketh hidden
In the place where His Wise Ones are.

From the Epworth Press comes a volume on the Social Problem. Its title is *Christian Responsibility for the Social Order* (6s. net). It is a heavy title. We have no love now for titles of such generality. But you try to find a better title—after you have read the book—and then let us hear from you. The author is the Rev. Samuel E. Keeble, who has made the Social Order his province through many years of private study and public service. If there had been a more captivating title, that was also descriptive, he would himself have discovered it.

What is the Social Order? It is that condition of society which we owe to the Bible and the Romans. We are not satisfied with it. The Socialist is most expressive of his dissatisfaction, but even 'our ancient aristocracy' is dissatisfied. And the dissatisfaction is due to the fact that we owe the present state of society to the Bible *and* the Romans. If we had owed it to the Bible only, the Socialist might have been content; if we had owed it entirely to the Romans, the aristocrat would have been silent.

For 'the Biblical conception of property rests upon production, the Roman upon possession, and not even upon personal possession but legal, a far more extended and indefinite thing.' And again, 'the Biblical conception of property rests upon personal labour, the Roman upon superior force, exercised at first through a monopoly of arms, later, one of money.'

So here is the responsibility of the follower of Christ. 'There is guilt upon the Christian conscience for allowing this heathen conception of property to grow up and to write itself upon the statute-books of this realm, with ever-increasing completeness and complexity. Christian principles relating to persons and property have been allowed to suffer eclipse. Property has been, and still largely is, placed before humanity in actual legal practice—things before persons; offences against property have been punished much more severely than those against human beings, *e.g.*, poaching than wife-brutality. Property, private property, has been made almost sacred, and efforts persist still to confer upon it absolute rights. This hardening of the law against producers in favour of possessors was a flat departure from the more Christian conceptions of the old social order. The condemnation of Christians, especially influential Christians, and of the Church, is that they succumbed so easily to a new spirit in law, which their instincts must have told them could not be harmonized either with the Hebrew Law or with Christian ethics—in a word, with the sacred Scriptures.'

Few of Messrs. Harrap's 'Poetry and Life' series seem to have come our way, and that is a pity, if the rest are at all like Mr. Allardyce Nicoll's book on *William Blake and his Poetry* (1s. 6d.). An easier introduction to Blake you will not find, nor a more reliable. At last Blake has passed into the stage of criticism which may be called appreciative insight, *without the addition of allowances made for weaknesses*. That stage has at last arrived both for Burns and for Blake.

The Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., has completed his life's task. With *Eschatology* (Longmans; 9s. net) and the Indexes, he concludes the series of ten volumes in which he gives an account of the whole range of Dogmatic Theology. Every volume, as it has appeared, has been noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; and the last deserves all the appreciation that was expressed for the best of them. Its subject is the most difficult of all. To gather it within the range of a single volume is an accomplishment. No important point is overlooked; no fruitful book or pamphlet is forgotten. The record of literature has been a feature throughout; its selection almost a miracle. Running through the lists in this volume one scarcely detects a mistake, either in rejection or in choice. And always it is up to date. On the Second Advent Professor R. G. Macintyre's fine book, *The Other Side of Death*, is included among the rest.

From the Methodist Book Concern of New York and Cincinnati comes a thick, convenient, closely printed volume containing the *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 1920. It is of wider interest than the membership of that

Church. In the earnest endeavour after union, so pathetically characteristic of our day, it will repay study and may show how some avenue will open.

The National Sunday School Union (57 Ludgate Hill, E.C.) has undertaken the issue of a series of books to be called 'Every Teacher's Library.' The first volume, edited by Elsie H. Spriggs, is *The Missionary Enterprise in the Sunday School* (2s. 6d. net). There are other five contributors, all experienced teachers and all aware of the necessity of unfailing concreteness and abundant illustration.

From the same Publishing House comes the volume for 1923 of *Notes on the Scripture Lessons*. It is the 79th volume—a good record. For the demand of the Sunday School is every year for more efficient methods of teaching and more scholarly interpretation of Scripture. The 'Notes' have steadily met the demand.

Messrs. Scribner of New York have published a handsome volume with the title of *The Children's Bible* ($3.50). It contains selections from the Old and New Testaments translated and arranged by Henry A. Sherman, Head of the Department of Religious Literature of Charles Scribner's Sons, and Charles Foster Kent, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University.

The translation is in modern English. Its touch of simplicity makes the difference between it and Moffatt's translation. This is the parable of the Prodigal Son:

'Jesus said, "There was a man who had two sons. The younger said to his father, 'Father, give me the part of your property that belongs to me.' So the father divided his property between his two sons. A few days later, the younger son got together all that he had and went into a distant country where he wasted his money in reckless living. After he had spent it all, there was a great famine in the land, and he began to be in want. So he agreed to work for a man of that country, who sent him into his fields to feed swine; and he was ready to eat even the pods that the swine were eating, for no one gave him food. But when he came to himself he said, 'How many of my father's hired servants have more than enough to eat while I die here of hunger! I will go to my father and say, "Father, I have sinned against God and against you. I am no longer worthy to be called your son. Treat me as one of your hired servants."'

'"So he went to his father. But while he was still a long way off, his father saw him and felt pity for him, and ran and threw his arms about his neck and tenderly kissed him. Then his son said to him, 'Father, I have sinned against God and against you. I am no longer worthy to be called your son.' But the father said to his servants, 'Quick, bring a coat, the best, and put it on him and put a ring on his finger and sandals on his feet. And bring the fatted calf, kill it, and let us eat and be merry; for this son of mine was dead but has come back to life, he was lost but has been found.' So they began to make merry.

'"Now the elder son was out in the fields, and as he came near the house he heard music and dancing. And he called one of the servants and asked what all this meant. The servant said to him, 'Your brother has come, and your father has killed the fatted calf because he has him back safe and sound.' And he was angry and would not go in, so his father came out to reason with him, but he answered, 'See all these many years I have worked for you and never disobeyed one of your commands, yet you never gave me so much as a young goat that I might have a feast with my friends. But now when this son of yours comes, who has wasted your money with wicked women, you kill the fatted calf for him!' His father answered, 'Son, you are with me always and all that I have is yours; but it was right to make merry and rejoice because of your brother, for he was dead but has come back to life, he was lost but has been found.'"'

The volume contains many illustrations on plate paper. Some of them are in colour. All are reproductions of famous paintings.

A volume of essays on Dante by Prebendary Lonsdale Ragg, B.D., has been published under the title of *Dante Alighieri, Apostle of Freedom* (Stockwell; 6s. net). As the title indicates, the prevailing idea is that of Dante's interest in political liberty. But the most original of the essays is the first, which speaks of Dante as the 'Apostle of Love,' and tells us of 'the swift upward movement of Dante's *Paradiso*, where the spirit mounts from sphere to sphere, from glory to glory, impelled and wafted by the sheer force of Love, till at last, in face of the Triune blessedness, it is plunged into an ineffable joy and wonder—ineffable because, as he says, "as it draweth nigh to its ideal, the

object of its longing, our intellect sinketh so deep that memory cannot go back upon the track." '

Are Temperance Reformers Cranks? (S.C.M.; 4d.). Viscountess Astor, M.P., proves that they are not. Which is a pity. For all the best people in the world have been cranks, or have been called so, from John the Baptist until now. And there is no man or woman with eyes to see and a heart to feel but would at this present time be thankful to be called a temperance fanatic.

A Synopsis for the Study of the Bible Treatment of Social Questions has been prepared by Professor C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D. (S.C.M.; 6d. net). The demand is urgent—who could have met it more competently? Dr. Ryder Smith's great book, 'The Bible Doctrine of Society,' contains the material of the Synopsis.

A supplement to Dr. Ryder Smith's Synopsis, appropriately published by the same firm, is *Outline Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society* (3d. net), prepared by H. A. Mess, B.A.

An extremely suggestive book on the second Gospel—*St. Mark's Life of Jesus* (S.C.M.; 4s. net)—has been written by the Rev. T. H. Robinson, M.A., D.D., of University College, Cardiff. Suggestive we say: Dr. Robinson suggests and does no more, and that deliberately. He would have you read St. Mark's Gospel itself. But as you read it after reading his book you will read it with much more intelligence, with much more delight, with much more edification.

The Stories of the Kingdom, by G. R. H. Shafto (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net), is a student's book. It is properly called 'a *Study* of the Parables of Jesus.' After some chapters of introduction, packed with matter, each of the parables receives a short exposition, and the exposition is followed by 'Helps to Meditation or Discussion.' Take an example of the 'Helps':

'We find it hard, in actual practice, to believe that God loves men. Consider how impossible it is for a child to understand its parents' love for it. Read and lay to heart Jude 21—God's love for us (see Moffatt's Translation).

'"Lost" means "Not found yet."—*Edna Lyall.*

'J. is very depressed and confides to you that she has lost all hope; that her life is darkened by the feeling that she is a lost soul; talks about the unforgivable sin. Write her a helpful letter.

'Note the certainty with which Jesus speaks about Heaven: how the Father's Will is done there, how they neither marry nor are given in marriage, how the angels of the little ones behold the Father's face, how they rejoice over repentant sinners—always something man doesn't know of himself, yet realizes its truth when told. How does this affect our view of Jesus? And of Heaven?

'X. says: "I have tried to love God; but I think my past life has simply destroyed my capacity for any such love." What can you say to X.?'

It is the missionary to the Eskimo that can surpass St. Paul's catalogue of sufferings for the sake of Christ. 'A day and a night have I been in the deep': the Right Rev. J. Lofthouse, D.D., Bishop of Keewatin, has been weeks at a time in the deep. You will scarcely find a more admirable tale of endurance. The explorer of North Pole or South Pole or Himalayan mountain is not in it. And it is all told with modesty and reserve. *A Thousand Miles from a Post Office* is the title (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net).

The Bishop of Willochra, the Right Rev. Gilbert White, M.A., D.D., is a preacher. And he knows what it costs to be a preacher. So for the sake of those who have to preach, without having had the usual training (they are numerous in Australia), he has written and published *Fifty-Six Short Sermons* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. 6d. net).

The sermons have points. They have other virtues—direct language, orderly arrangement, sound doctrine. But that is their chief virtue. They may be read, remembered, and reproduced; and yet in the reproduction the sermon may be the preacher's own.

But better than all admiration will be one of the sermons. It will be found among the sermons for the Christian Year.

The author of *India and her Peoples* (United Council for Missionary Education, 2 Eaton Gate, London; 2s.) has either an intimate personal knowledge of India or else an intimate acquaintance with those who have. The author is F. Deaville Walker. The book carries you through the cities, through the villages, into the temples, into the homes. The illustrations are excellent, but they are unnecessary.

The Nature of Redemption.

By the Reverend A. E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London.

III.

1. I must now attempt as simply and briefly as possible to show how far this teaching of Paul can be made our own. (*a*) Can we agree with him that there is a reaction of God's perfection against sin, that not only does He act against sin in His judgment on sin in its consequences, but that He feels against sin what Paul calls *wrath*, displeasure? So long as from the latter conception we exclude resentment, and only include an indignation against the sin which gives only greater intensity to the compassion for the sinner, I can follow Paul so far, and my conscience approves his doctrine. (*b*) Can we regard the moral order of the world in the consequences—physical, moral, social, spiritual—as a manifestation of this reaction of God against sin, not adequate at present, but anticipatory of an adequate manifestation hereafter, whether in the future life for the individual or a future age of human history for the race, unless grace triumph over sin? To this view also I can give assent (*c*) Can we regard death as not a physical event, and as such a natural necessity only, but as belonging to the manifestation of God's judgment? The meaning with which it has been invested by the human conscience, accepted and approved by Christ, seems to me to warrant our so regarding it. As far as our earthly life is concerned, apart from the Christian hope, death to the thoughtful and serious cannot be only a physical event without any moral or religious meaning. (*d*) Do we believe that it was necessary that Christ should so suffer on His Cross in order that man might not misunderstand God's forgiveness as showing God's indifference to his sin, but might understand it as coming to him in such a way as to make him aware of God's judgment on sin, and so of his need of penitence for sin? Even subjective theories of the atonement admit this necessity. This moral influence, at least, the Cross must have. (*e*) Are we prepared to go the step further which to me it seems certain that Paul takes, that it is necessary for God Himself as the eternally perfect, in consistency with His own character, in the fulfilment of His purpose to make men perfect as He Himself is, to vindicate His righteousness, to manifest His judgment, to reveal the reaction of His nature against sin? Although we must recognize that we are moving in a region where reverence might enjoin silence, and human analogies cannot carry us far, yet surely we must have ourselves felt the necessity of finding an expression for the demand of conscience when that demand was being challenged in the world. When it is a question merely of personal reputation a man may be content to be silent or inactive, although in the interests of public morality it might sometimes be better that he should speak or act, as the occasion might require. But should he be placed in a position of responsibility, when his silence or inactivity might be regarded as a condonation of wrong, then he owes it to himself as well as society to show that, and how he condemns the wrong. If God's purpose in the world is not accidental to His character, but is that character in action, it is a necessity for Himself to put beyond doubt or question His judgment of the sin that challenges His purpose and contradicts His character. (*f*) Do we not in fact make a mistake in distinguishing the subjective and the objective aspects of the atonement, how it affects man and God; for is there not a moral affinity of God and man, and is not God's purpose for man a moral community? What is necessary to bring man to penitence and faith is necessary for God, as the fulfilment of His purpose depends on it; how can penitence be necessary in man towards sin, if condemnation of sin is not necessary for God. Can penitence be anything else than man's recognition of, and response to, God's condemnation? What my Christian conscience has taught me at least is that God must, even in forgiving, judge sin. (*g*) When we pass the further question, How does Christ's death realize God's condemnation of sin? Paul's answer is not complete; but he does teach quite plainly that Christ did bear the consequences of man's sin, was made sin on our behalf (2 Co 5^{21}), and became a curse for us (Gal 3^{13}). Even if the preposition ὑπὲρ, and not ἀντί, is generally used, we cannot escape the doctrine of substitution. He suffered that we might not suffer, and what is that

but that He suffered instead of us? Just what Jesus did suffer, how He could so suffer, and why He must suffer, Paul does not tell us; and we must try to answer these questions without his aid, even if we agree with Paul that it was in the death of Christ God proved Himself both just and the justifier of the ungodly.

2. I must attempt in closing to indicate what answer I should give to these questions. (i) As to the actuality of the sacrifice I hold that we do not do justice to the records of the agony of Gethsemane or the desolation of Calvary, unless we recognize that for the moral conscience and religious consciousness of Jesus death was the judgment of sin, and might involve a severance of man's fellowship with God. God did not abandon Him; but in His own sense of His relation to God He did think and feel forsaken, even if only for a moment, for, subject as He was to our human limitations, His consciousness of the reality of God might be obscured. He tasted death on learning in His own experience the worst that death could be. For the godless that may not be the worst, for the Son of God it was the worst, and the depth of His agony no human grief can fathom. While this is a holy of holies, we should try to realize what for us men and our salvation He endured, what our redemption cost as well as won.

> Yea, once Immanuel's orphaned cry
> His Universe hath shaken,
> It went up single, echoless,
> My God, I am forsaken.
> It went up from the Holy's lips
> Amid His last creation
> That of the last no son should use
> These words of desolation.

(ii) As to the possibility of such an experience we are able to offer some suggestions, anticipated by Paul in his doctrine of the solidarity of the human race in sin and grace alike, and his experience of the identification of his life with Christ's and Christ's with his. Man as personably is social; he can take the life of others into his own, and live his own life in others. Love by its very nature is vicarious. Christ loved both God and man, and so perfectly that He could identify Himself with God and man. He not only endured the Cross in obedience to God and compassion for man, but in His experience on the Cross He identified Himself with God's judgment on sin, and with man's endurance of that judgment. As one with man in love He endured, and as one with God in love He approved the judgment of sin. Sinless as He was, His endurance of the doom of sin was an acceptance which perfectly corresponded to that approval. We may hesitate to use the words repentance or confession of the sinless; but we may say that His sacrifice was the human Amen to the divine sentence of death on sin. On His Cross man and God were in perfect accord in regard to sin. It is evident why the death under such conditions was necessary. Only thus could even He apprehend all that God's judgment on sin involves, when God required of Him so to die; only thus could He apprehend all that death may mean for man, as all the conditions of His death exposed to Him the enormity of man's sin, and made Him acutely sensitive to its shame and sorrow. (iii) So, approaching our last question—the necessity that God's judgment on sin should be realized in Christ's Cross—we may have caught some glimpses of the truth that may scatter our difficulties. A logical demonstration of that necessity it would be impiety either to ask or to offer. If for Jesus, even in Gethsemane, it was possible to believe that the cup might pass, and if only in agony of prayer even He was taught that the cup could not pass (Mt $26^{39.42}$), how irreverent is it for human cleverness to attempt to prove that necessity. I myself believe that we must learn that necessity, as Jesus did, upon our knees, in moral intuition and spiritual discernment. Christ's perfect approval as Son of God and perfect acceptance as Son of Man of the judgment of God on sin in death in an undivided consciousness (the aspects and relations of which we must distinguish) established once for all that moral community of God and man which is the fulfilment of God's purpose for man, and established that community in respect of what was necessary if God's forgiveness was not to be misunderstood as indifference to sin, but to be understood as in the very form in which it came, judging finally and adequately the sin forgiven.

3. But how does the Cross offer forgiveness? We must remember that the Crucified in the days of the flesh revealed God's fatherhood, and in God's name offered forgiveness to sinners, that He apprehended His death as a ransom for many, and as the sacrifice of the new covenant between God and man, that on His Cross He prayed for

the forgiveness of those who crucified Him, that in His dying He proved not only His fidelity to God, but His sympathy with, and compassion for, man. The whole New Testament records the experience of men who had found forgiveness in Christ and Christ crucified. The interpretation given above offers us a reason for this assurance. In Christ's consciousness the moral affinity of God and man was realized in a moral community of judgment of sin, and what is forgiveness but the restoration of man's moral community with God, disturbed by sin? Christ by His Spirit reproduces that consciousness in believers, for in Him they die unto sin, and live unto God, and so the broken fellowship is renewed. When in penitence they accept and approve God's judgment, then and only then can they in faith receive the grace wherein they stand as sons redeemed by the Son of God.

4. Any statement must be incomplete, and yet the Christian thinker must do his utmost to get as near completeness as he can. While we must recognize the necessity of the death of Christ as penal substitution and satisfaction, not in the sense that He felt Himself guilty, or was punishment by God, but in the sense that in submitting unto death He not only shared with man the consequences of sin, but accepted and approved the moral order of God which appointed these consequences, yet the value of the death of Christ transcends that necessity. It is not Christ's suffering with which God is well pleased; it is those sufferings as the necessary sacrifice of a love such as His for a race such as ours in a world of sin, pain, and death. It is the perfect love, compassionate to man and obedient to God, that has in itself a value so absolute, revealing and realizing eternal perfection, that it once for all in human history gives the promise and the pledge that God's purpose, challenged by sin, will be fulfilled. God is justified in His permission and tolerance of sin in the world, in His judgments that have ever fallen short of the extinction of sinners, by introducing into human history the Cross that judges in forgiving sin, because He has therein brought into the human race a standard, a motive, and a power of holy love, which are a morally and spiritually recreative activity of God for the effective transformation of sinners into sons and saints. The sinful, sorrowing, dying world without the Cross would make belief in God as holy love well-nigh impossible; the Cross in such a world makes faith in the eternal perfection of God not only possible, but certain and confident. As moral achievement, no less than moral endurance, it justifies God's forgiveness of the race which Christ represents, and justifies man's faith in the God whom Christ reveals. Its absolute value more than compensates for the detraction from the world's moral value due to sin. There is active, no less than passive, obedience; there is merit no less than satisfaction.. In the Cross not only is every barrier to the holy love of God to mankind removed; it is the channel for the full flow of that holy love.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform.[1]

Professor Clay is one of the best and most accurate copyists of cuneiform texts, and he has a *flair* for discovering the most interesting among them. His new work is based on certain tablets in the Pierpont Morgan collection, one of which is an ancient version of the story of the Deluge. This, he points out, is an early form of the story as given in two broken tablets in the British Museum, which is known to Assyriologists as the 'Ea and Atrakhasis' version, and he gives revised translations of both of them. He has added to them the fragments of some other versions—a little fragment of thirteen lines written probably in the Kassite period, the Deluge story preserved in the fragments of Berossus, the fragment of a Sumerian version in the Philadelphia Museum, and another fragment dated in the eleventh year of Ammizadok (B.C. 1966) which is now in the Pierpont Morgan collection. As I stated in my *Higher Criticism* thirty years ago, there were many different versions of the story current in Babylonia, and

[1] *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform*, by Albert T. Clay. Oxford University Press, 1922.

the standard Assyrian one embodied in the Epic of Gilgames is a combination of at least two of them.

Professor Clay, however, is not content with giving the text and translation of the Babylonian versions with full notes and commentary; he is the protagonist of the theory which would derive Babylonian culture from the Amorites or Western Semites instead of the contrary, and he endeavours to show that there are 'Amorite' and non-Babylonian words and other elements in the Pierpont Morgan version of the legend of the Flood which justify him in calling it a Hebrew story. I confess that here I cannot follow him; his evidence for 'Amorite' words and expressions seems to me to rest either upon more or less arbitrary interpretations or upon the assumption that because a word has not yet been met with in Babylonian literature, or occurs in it but seldom, it must therefore come from a foreign source. Nor can I follow him in rejecting the North Arabian origin of that portion of the Semitic-speaking populations which have the physical characteristics of the dolichocephalic Beduin. How, for instance, would he explain the fact that the Semitic *âlu* 'city' originally signified a tent (Heb. *ohel*), while the Hebrew *'îr* is borrowed from Sumerian?

Nevertheless, the arguments with which he enforces his theory are suggestive and stimulating, and there is an element of truth at the bottom of them. If the Amorite peoples of Western Asia first received their culture from Babylonia they afterwards repaid it. Amorite dynasties held sway in early Babylonia and brought back to it a civilization and literature which they had modified and improved.

The book is full of new and interesting matter and abounds in points which suggest further notes. Thus in the quotation from Ælian the statement that the father of Etana-Gilgamos was 'a man of low degree' is explained by our finding in the Babylonian annals that Arwium, the predecessor of Etana, was 'the son of a plebeian.' *Dap(i)nu*, again (p. 37), was a royal title, and we may therefore conclude that the object of Etana's flight to heaven on the back of an eagle was to obtain possession of the royal insignia stored up there and thus establish himself as 'a mighty one' upon earth.

Professor Clay translates *ummu khubur*, the title given to Tiamat, 'the Deep,' in the Creation Epic, as 'mother of the assembly'; I should prefer to see in Khubur the name of the river of death which the dead had to cross and which was located in the north. Tiamat is called *Tiumê wê muqribat*, 'the Deep which collects the waters,' in one of the Assur tablets (*Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, p. 40, l. 22).

I have discovered only one error in this beautifully printed volume—'Erechian' instead of 'Eridian,' p. 41.

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Field Preacher.

'Look at the flowers of the field.'—Mt 6^{28}.

Isn't it a pity that we hear so very little in the Bible of what Jesus did when He was a small boy like you? It would have been fine to know who called in for Him on a morning on the way to school; and how He managed to do all His lessons, and yet help the little ones at night; and how He did at games. I'm sure that they picked Him at once when they were choosing sides, for He would always play His best, and never be selfish, would think always of the side. We don't hear much of that, only of what He was and did when He grew up, and became a man and a minister. And yet we do know something of Him as a little chap. You very little bodies have a game that you call 'Houses.' You aren't just you. Oh no, you're Lady this, and Sir Somebody that, and you do the most wonderful things. And I think that, as a wee man, Jesus must have played too at 'pretending'—funerals and marriages, and all the rest of it. And perhaps they had great frolics of an evening at that home in Nazareth, with the workshop for a glorious playroom. At all events, Jesus seems to know about patches on boys' clothes, had seen His mother turn them round and

round, and shake her head because at last they wouldn't mend any more; remembered that one day when He was preaching. And He was very fond of flowers—was always, I think, that. Once, when He was preaching, He stopped and said, Oh, don't listen to Me, look at those flowers over there! They are far better preachers than I am! Look at them, and listen to them, and learn what they keep teaching you. Well, that's a funny kind of preacher, isn't it—a flower? And yet, you know what daisies are—those pretty little flowers that blush so prettily at the tips of their petals when the sun looks at them, like shy wee girls? Well, a wise man once said that he had learned far more from a daisy—one of these little things you pulled and threw away when you were making chains of them—than from all the wisest men in all the world. So let us take a flower, say a white lily with its golden heart—for all the world like your little yellow-haired brother lying fast asleep in his white bed—or any flower at all, even the commonest of them, and look at it as Jesus bids us do, and see what it can teach us—this little 'field preacher,' as Wesley called the men that preached out in the open air.

The first thing is Perseverance. What a great big hard word! Yes, and the thing itself is often just as hard to do, though not to understand. For Perseverance just means keeping on; trying, and trying, and still trying, and never giving in though nothing seems to come of it. Some of you aren't just very clever, you haven't a quick brain, get puzzled over sums and things. And by and by you lose heart. It's not a bit of use, you pout. I can't do it; and never will, and so you throw the book away; and only do your lessons well enough to be able to say you did them; and don't stick in and do your best and most at all. I did, you say, but nothing came of it. I did try for a whole long week, and was as low down in the class as ever. It's no good. But if the plant said that, it would never have a flower at all. All through the winter it keeps working, working, working; and there is nothing to show for it all; never a shoot of green. But it keeps working, has made up its mind, and doesn't care how long it takes. And at long last up the little nose comes peeping through the earth; and the shoot grows, and leaves come out. Yet weeks and months go by and there is never a trace of any flower, but still it keeps on working, working, working. And, at last, look! There's a bud! A few weeks more of hard, hard toil, and the splendid blossom will be really there. And are you going to be beaten by a plant, to give up trying any more so soon, because it doesn't come at once?

But it's no use trying to be good, you say. I'm not that kind, am far too tempery and quick with my fists; just can't help being cross. I did try, but it made no difference. Last Saturday I had to field for hours and hours, and then they said that I was l.b.w. first ball, and I was sure I wasn't, and got ratty over it. Or Mother sent you for a message, and you went, sulky as a bear. Well, that was a pity, but do you know there are some flowers that work on for a whole hundred years with not one thing to hearten them. But they keep at it, and it really comes some day; and they keep trying, trying. I have seen a plant have its first blossom after a whole century. Up again, and stick in, and you will gain yours yet, if you keep trying like the flowers.

And then our wee field preacher shows us how to keep clean and beautiful. You know how bees love to go in and out among the flowers, how, getting pollen on their legs, they carry it from one flower to another, and spoil the colour of them, sometimes. I remember a bonnie flower of a lovely new colour, and all the summer people always stopped and said how beautiful it was. And next year we watched, and we waited for it, and then buds formed, and then they slowly opened, and—whatever was wrong? The beautiful flower was quite spoiled: it was all blotchy, like your little brother when he had measles—or scarlet fever was it?—only it had all kinds of colours mixed up in little bits. And the wise people told me that it was the bees that had done this. Ah, but there are some wise plants that shut up, and won't let insects in. No, no, they say, none of you and your meddlesomeness. I don't want to be made all queer and different colours, I want to keep white and clean, and they shut up tight. Remember that, and when some fellow wants you to listen to a nasty story, or tries to lead you into what you know is not playing the game, or tempts you, shut up at once, keep out these tiresome bees, and don't allow them to meddle with you.

But our little field preacher assures us that the most important thing of all is to remember to sow the proper seed. Don't forget, it says, that you can only have what you sow. It's no use sowing chickweed, and expecting to have sweet-peas or

mignonette. If you sow chickweed, you can pick only chickweed; if you want forget-me-not, then you must sow forget-me-not. And that's what we forget. Sometimes when you're late for breakfast you have been lying dreaming of how brave you're going to be when you grow up, of the daring and splendid things you are to do. I hope you will; but I don't think it's likely, because the other day at school, when the master was in a bit of a temper, you got scared and looked along at what the other chaps had written. But that's chickweed you're sowing, not sweet-peas. You can't do that kind of thing now, and be a brave man later. You're not sowing the proper seed. Or, you girls sometimes tell yourselves, Poor Mother looks dreadfully tired. Wait till I'm older, and how I'll look after her, and let her have a splendid time! Yet when she asks you to help her, you're so sulky, and so petted over it. You're sowing the wrong seed, you'll never get the flowers you are expecting. Root out the weeds and nettles, and begin to be what you would like to be, that's the one way of reaching it.

And lastly, says our wee field preacher, we must remember, that like flowers and weeds, we are all sending seeds flying about the world and making others round us either worse or better, either happier or else less happy. We mayn't believe it, we may never know, but it is true. And so it is very important what we do and are. There is a flower called ragwort, but most people call it Stinking Willie. It's rather pretty, but it has a horrid smell; and folk in Scotland say that it wasn't always there, that it was never seen until the Duke of Cumberland, who fought against Prince Charlie, brought some hay from Holland or from Denmark which had the seeds of ragwort in it, and they took root and grew, and sowed themselves further and further and still further, until all over Scotland you can find it now. And so if you are cross, you know well how that tends to sow itself, and spread out to the others; and soon they are as cross as you. We must take care. Ah, but the other side is just as true. Do you know the mimulus? It's rather like a little fool's cap for a fairy's head. It's yellow, with red spots; and people sow it in their gardens. But there's one place in Scotland where it grows wild like a weed; all along the burns and streams and the banks of a great river, there are lovely sheets of its living gold. And how did it get there? A wise man traced it back and back, until high up among the hills he came upon the ruins of a cottage, the garden of which lay beside a little burn. Some one had had a mimulus there, and its seeds fell into the water, and were carried down, and grew along the burn's banks; and the next year these seeded themselves further down; and so on every year, and then along a bigger stream, and so on to the river, here and there, over half a country. And all that beauty was traced back to that one plant up there beside the lonely cottage. The shepherd's wife was very busy. She had heaps of important things to do. There were the children to be sent off to school; and it was washing day; and before she was finished, she saw, far off, a visitor coming across the moors, and had to hurry and bake scones and oatcakes to be ready for her—there were all kinds of really important things to be put through, and she was rushed and tired, and when the visitor gave her the mimulus, she thanked her, and just stuck it in anywhere. And yet that was a really important thing, with far bigger results than all the rest, that will live on and on and on, far down the years. It must be fine to win a big war, or to write a great book that will never die, but is there anything more beautiful than to make a whole countryside bright with a new and lovely flower? And she did that, not knowing she was doing it, just sticking in a plant into her garden-bed. And every time that we are leal and true and honest and unselfish in little things that seem to us quite small and unimportant, seeds are carried, further than we know, and other folk are helped to become leal and true and honest and unselfish too.

Let us remember that, and always do our best. There is a bonnie little flower that grows near Rome, so I have heard, and nowhere, I believe, in Britain, except in one place, near Hexham. And they tell us that just as Scottish soldiers love the Scottish heather, like to have it sent to them, so, long ago, the Roman soldiers loved this little flower because it reminded them of home, and so they tried to grow it here and there; but it wouldn't take root; and by and by they gave it up, as hopeless. But at Hexham there was a cavalry depot, I've been told, and some hay that happened to come in a transport from Rome was sent up for the horses there. It had, it seems, the seeds of this little flower in it, and they took root, and sowed themselves, and there it grows unto this day, at Hexham as at Rome. They weren't think-

ing about it, it just came. And so I don't know that we need to worry too much about things. If we just do our duty, like these Roman soldiers in their barracks there, if we stick in to our lessons, and try to be unselfish in our homes, and good-natured at our games, perhaps the lovely plant of Christlikeness, which we can't grow at all, will spring up of itself, before we know.

Footprints.

'The way of his steps.'—Ps 85^{13}.

Not long ago I was told about a stone up in the north of Scotland, at Inverness, I think. I am not quite sure that I have got the story altogether right; but, as I remember, it was something like this. It seems that there is this stone. If you were to look at it you would say, 'Well, what about it: it's just a common bit of rock.' But look at it again! Don't you see that there is a footprint in it, a step made by a naked foot. What does that mean, do you think? Is it that once upon a time, long, long ago—oh yes, even before father was born, a great while before that—some man was walking, and set his foot down here, when the stone wasn't a stone as yet, was still loose sand wet by the tides of some forgotten sea? I wonder what kind of man he was. Well, we don't know. He left just this one footstep and passed on, and so we've lost him.

But you remember Robinson Crusoe, how in his lonely island yonder, one day, as, dressed in his goat skin and his peaked fur cap, he was wandering along as usual, he stopped with his eyes staring out of his head, staring at something—at a footprint in the sand. It wasn't his, for the tide would have washed it out since last he was that way. And what could it mean, for there was no one else? For months and years he had heard nothing but the sound of the breakers, and the wind in the trees, and the screaming of the parrot. And with that his heart leaped up. This may mean home, for somebody has come. And then it sank again. But who? For it might be a murderous gang of pirates, who would take his life.

And so he crept on, following the footsteps, to find out what kind of man it was, and came, as you remember, on a knot of cannibals getting ready to eat up poor Friday. He found out what they were like by following their footsteps.

Well, this man tells us that God too has been walking through the world, and if we follow in His steps we will come upon Him, and find out what He is like. And the best way to do that is to follow Jesus Christ. You know there was once a little laddie in a Highland village, just a wee fellow like you, who had to get up when he was sleepy, and go to bed dreadfully early as it seemed, who had lessons to do, and messages to run, and Mother to help, and the little ones to amuse, sometimes when the other boys were away out to the hills. He was just a boy like you, with little things like that to do. His footsteps are quite small, no bigger than your own. Yet follow him up and down that village, and you will learn what God is like. For that wee laddie was the very likest thing to God in all this world. Now, why? Why when people look at Christ do they think of God, just as when people look at you they think of Mother, and say how like her you have grown? Did you ever think what God is like? He is the very dearest, and nicest, and most unselfish Person in the world. And it is because Jesus was so unselfish, so good-natured, so sunny, so kind, so thoughtful for others, so forgetful of Himself in the little things He had to do, that people said, 'Why He is just like God, exactly like, has got God's very ways.'

And then when He grew up, follow His footsteps then. How many there are, all over the country, for He was always helping people. You can see them easily in the dusty roads. Look, here He went into a house. Yes, there was some one there tired or ill or unhappy, and He went to cheer them. And here He stopped short in the middle of the road. Yes, there was a woman whose son was being carried to his grave, and He stopped and gave him back to her. And here He went into a place where all kind of ill folk were lying wearily. Ah, yes! you are sure to find Him here. Always, you see, He is working for other people, never thinking of Himself, is being kind and good and generous and unselfish. And that is what God is like. We've found it out by following Christ's footsteps. He is the dearest, and the kindest, and most unselfish Person ever seen. He never thinks about Himself at all, but always what more can He do for some one else. Look at the things He does for you, day after day, and never tires of it. Wouldn't you like to put your arms about His neck, and thank Him for it all.

Well, but about my little story and the stone.

It seems it wasn't always here in Inverness, but once lay out on a hillside; and always when a chief of a certain clan died, the new, young chief put his foot into the footprint in the stone, and swore to be true to the clan; that he too, like those who had gone before him, would live for the clan, work for the clan, die for the clan.

And here are the footprints that Jesus Christ has left. And it is not enough to look at Him, and say how splendid and brave and kind He was. We must make up our minds to be so too, to follow in His steps. There's a man in the *Pilgrim's Progress*—don't you know the *Pilgrim's Progress*! well, you keep asking Mother to read it to you till she does, it's just dreadfully exciting—who says that whenever he sees a footprint of Christ on the ground, he covets to set his own foot in it. You see what that means, don't you? Here are you getting quite old, the young chief of your own life, won't you put your foot into the print upon the stone, Christ's print, and swear that, like Dad and Mother, and those who went before you, you too will think of others, work for others, live for others, and for Jesus Christ and God, will follow in Christ's steps? If you do, says this Psalmist, God will be on your side, and He will help you, guide you, strengthen you, show you how to follow in the way of His steps.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Heavenly Pattern.

'See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.'—He 8^5.

We have in the Book of Exodus the account of that visit which Moses paid to Jehovah Himself in the excellent glory above Mount Sinai—a visit lasting forty days and forty nights, during which time Moses received from God most explicit instructions concerning a tabernacle which he was to make for the particular dwelling-place of Jehovah among His people. And not only did he receive instructions—or, as we might say, specifications—concerning the structure of that building, but he also saw the heavenly things, the heavenly purpose, the great truths of which that building, when it should be finished, would be but a type, a kind of parable in gold and linen and brass and silver.

In other words, Moses was invited up into the presence of God and into the vision of the heavenly things in order that he might reproduce in type the things which he had seen. Again and again was given to him the solemn exhortation: 'See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.'

Just so, we are set in the world to have visions, to go up into the mount, to see, in the presence of God, the divine truth concerning human life, and then to work it out into character and conduct. It may be said without exaggeration, without qualification, that in a very real, thorough, broad sense, this sums up the thought of Christian living and of the purpose of God in our redemption. What may we learn from the tabernacle in the wilderness that shall help us in reproducing, in character and conduct, heavenly things? The commission to Moses was that it was to be beautiful. The life that you and I are commissioned to live, and the character you and I are under responsibility to form, must then be, first of all, beautiful.

1. There have been many ideals of character, and each of them, no doubt, so formed under Christian influence that they contain important elements of truth. The Puritan character was, in many respects, most admirable. It had in it elements of strength, of sincerity, of simplicity, of great loyalty to God, and of obedience to what they understood to be the will of God. No fragmentary form of character could be more noble than the Puritan ideal; and yet, as we look closely at that ideal, and as we measure it up against Christ, we begin to see that it is lacking precisely in this element of beauty. In Him there is nothing lacking, nothing in excess. Jesus Christ was perfectly strong. No Puritan was ever such a rock-man as He, and yet there was nothing hard or repelling in Christ's firmness; it was clothed in gentleness, and because He was supremely strong, He could be supremely gentle, patient, and sympathetic. In everything God makes there is first of all order, then comes symmetry. You remember in the 21st chapter of Revelation the description of the heavenly Jerusalem and its proportions; the breadth and the length and the height of it were equal. That is God's idea of symmetry. First of all, then, that tabernacle was beautiful, and it was beautiful because there was an ordered harmony in it. Everything was beautiful. And if we are reproducing the heavenly character here, then will, according to the prayer of the Psalmist, "the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us."

2. The second characteristic which we need to notice in the tabernacle built by Moses is its costliness. It was not a cheap thing which Moses built. God did not propose that the building in which His glory was in a very particular and local way to be manifested—and in itself a type of the costliest of all costly offerings, Jesus Christ—should be without cost. Everything in it was of the most precious materials. The very boards were overlaid with gold, solid gold. The seven-branched candlestick was of gold. There was embroidery of purple and scarlet and red and blue, with costliest work. The Holy Spirit endowed the craftsmen with more than earthly wisdom and skill that they might carve and embroider and engrave the beautiful details of that edifice. Splendid jewels flashed from the breastplate of the high priest and glittered upon his shoulders. Infinite skill of weaving and carving went into it. The first thought was beauty, then, and the second, costliness.

So these lives of ours will be heavenly in proportion as cost has gone into them. First of all, the unspeakable, the holy, the immeasurable gift and cost of our redemption. The costliest gift that heaven had was given for us, and we shall never come to the acme of Christian character and life without sacrifice—the best and costliest we have to give. It costs the renunciation of the lesser that we may have the greater, that we may grasp the choicest things and build them into character.

3. The third striking characteristic of the tabernacle is that its beauty was chiefly inward. All the glory of the gold, and all the beauty of the engravers' and weavers' and embroiderers' art was covered from outward observation. Christ was like that. He was not a man of marvellous beauty of visage and outward splendour of appearance: "When we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." Here, eminently, is a lesson for our day. The great temptation is to make religion a matter of externalities alone; but *to be* rather than to do is the central thought of God with regard to the character of His people; to be beautiful within.

There is the danger of hypocrisy, the danger that we shall seem to be more devoted, more consecrated, more engaged with the things of God than we really are. There is nothing for which Christ feels such an aversion as for hypocrisy. And the essence of hypocrisy is trying to seem to be a little sweeter, a little better, a little more devoted than we really are. When Moses came down from his forty days' visit with Jehovah, he had caught the very radiance of God's glory, but "Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone." There is nothing more odious than self-conscious piety.[1]

SUNDAY BEFORE ADVENT.

New Testament Certainty.

'That thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.'—Lk 1^4.

1. The books of the New Testament—from the Gospel of Matthew onward to the Apocalypse—though differing in style, object, and feeling, are marked by one characteristic which pervades them in every page—and that is, the *solemn tone of certainty* which runs through them. This characteristic distinguishes the New Testament books not only from all the Roman literature of the same age, but from all other Greek books that ever were written. In those literatures you have argument on both sides, guess, divination, doubt, mockery, despair. But here every page overflows with the feeling of certainty. The Evangelists and Apostles exhaust all the language of certainty in giving expression to their ideas. There are no words expressive of absolute truth and trustworthiness, and intense faith founded on that trustworthiness, which these men have not employed. 'This is the victory which has overcome the world' of doubters —'even their faith.'

2. This tone of absolute assurance is present when they speak of the facts of Christ's life, death, resurrection, and ascension; when they speak of what they call the 'doctrine' founded on those facts—the doctrine of 'the end of sins' made by sacrifice; of 'the abolition of death' by the resurrection of the Life-giver; of our 'gratuitous justification in Christ'; of our salvation 'by grace, not of works, lest any man should boast'; of the renewing work of the Holy Spirit; and of the resurrection to Eternal Life. And the same tone of certainty is present in those expressions which describe their own personal assurance of forgiveness, of salvation, of enjoying the present and everlasting favour of God. Look where you will you cannot discover a line, a word, a syllable, of uncertain, or less certain, utterance. The trumpet always gives a 'certain sound,' and it is the sound

[1] C. I. Scofield, *In Many Pulpits*, 269.

which proclaims the presence in the host of the Conqueror of Death.

3. Take the Evangelists. There are four biographers of Christ—men of as different make as any four biographers who could be found to-day—and yet, although two of them do not claim even to write as eye-witnesses; although they write from different standpoints, and give, so to speak, pictures from four different angles—yet nevertheless, amidst all diversities of style and treatment, the general spiritual result, as we know, is to portray one and the same majestic Divine Man—'the same Jesus' in all the four Gospels—that one Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, the very memory of whose sanctity has consecrated the whole land of Palestine as 'holy,' chiefly because His footsteps pressed it—and who has become the spiritual Lord of the modern world. And in these four Evangelists, so differing in the details of their books, the one feature common to all is this awe-striking impression of Certainty.

In the process of writing these four histories, with their numerous reports of astounding miracle, they make no concealment of the fact that the majority of the Jewish learned men of their day who beheld the miracles were not convinced by what Christ did and said; while they describe in artless language the early and only slowly dissolving doubts of some of their own most intimate companions, and even of the 'brothers' of Jesus. Yet amidst this strange frankness of report as to contemporary doubt and denial on the part of persons of the utmost social authority, and amidst all minor differences of statement as to times and places and successions of events—there prevails throughout the same calm and absolute tone of certainty as to the reality and truth of the general history, the miracles—the divine purity and glory—the death, resurrection, and ascension—of Him who spake the 'true sayings of God'—of Him on whose word the world might rest, as they did, with a confidence which purges the soul from an evil conscience, and takes away the sting of death.

4. Take the Apostles. The Apostles agree with the Evangelists that absolute certainty of truth, as far as they go, made known to them by inspiration, is to be found in their words. *Our* certitude, they say, is to be gained by receiving the gift of certainty in their instructions. In modern times men hold many different opinions on religion, most of them loosely and doubtfully, and they exert comparatively little influence on life. The Apostles, John, Peter, and Paul, very seldom express opinions of their own; but when they do, they carefully distinguish these from the absolute certainties which they set forth in the name of God, and which God had *revealed by His Spirit*. They set forth, not as a speculation but as certain truth, that Jesus was the predicted Christ—the Son of God; that His body was a temple of the Divine 'Logos,' or Word; that His death was a 'sacrifice' through which 'God reconciles the world to himself'; that our eternal life is a free gift in Christ; that our justification is gratuitous; that God's Spirit is given to renew man's nature in eternal life and holiness—and that such second birth is a pledge of everlasting salvation. And the very same temper of confident assurance of pardon, of acceptance with God, is inculcated on those who believe in Christ—the *assurance* of forgiveness, '*boldness to enter into the holiest*,' certainty of Resurrection to immortal life; so that we are to *rejoice in hope of the glory of God*.

The Apostles do not teach a doctrine merely, they declare an experience. They never try to assure themselves. They do not argue as if they were doubtful; they do not asseverate as if they were afraid. When they speak about Christ, and about salvation in Him, they speak about what they have personally 'handled and tasted.' And they are always confident, enthusiastic, jubilant. They manifestly rest in indubitable conclusions, both of intellect and heart. The life has proved the doctrine; they are virtually one with Christ, in life and in death.

The New Testament is so familiar to us that we read it often without realizing this quality in the tone of its writers, in comparison with that of our contemporaries. With few exceptions the tone of all modern writing is that of inquiry, investigation, opinion. The exceptions are in mathematical works, where perfect demonstration permits absolute certitude; and in physical science, where up to certain lines (sometimes transgressed by eminent popular writers who mistake the opinions or theory of scientific men for science), there is reason for the expression of a similar degree of confidence. But with these exceptions the modern tone of writing in matters of historical criticism, of art, of morality, of policy, is limited by the sense of fallibility.

But the writers of the New Testament, one and all, set themselves forth as 'foundation stones' of

the moral edifice, of the new humanity—the living temple. 'Ye are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' And respecting Him they say, speaking in the name of GOD, 'Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a ROCK, a solid rock, and he that believeth shall not be confounded.' [1]

5. Are we warranted in cherishing, in reference to that which they have communicated, anything like the same assurance as that which they possessed? On what grounds, if on any, are we justified in affirming that we, too, are certain that it is, in truth, the word of God that is revealed to us through them?

In nature, God may be said to be, in a sense, objectively revealed to men; but it is only when, and in so far as, a theistic interpretation is intuitively given to the facts of observation and experience. In like manner, it may be claimed that the facts of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ present objectively the truth which God would have us receive concerning His relations to us and our relations to Him; but here, also, it is only when by our own spiritual faculties we apprehend the spiritual significance of those facts that they become the medium of a Divine revelation to our minds and hearts. Of course, we could not have the revelation apart from the facts in the one case or in the other. Jesus Christ Himself is the grand central fact upon which all Christian revelation of the reflective and mediate types must rest; but it is by our own faculties that the revelation given through Him must be discerned. In the influence of His teaching and example upon us, we instinctively recognize the presence and power of the Divine. Our confidence in regard to this is confirmed when we find that many of our fellow-men bear testimony to the manifestation in Him of the same high ideals of character and life, and gratefully acknowledge the helpfulness of the influence which He exerts upon them. It is in this way that the testimony and fellowship of others corroborates our personal convictions and assurance.[2]

The Apostles were not ashamed of their message; they gloried in their Lord; the thought of the Church kindled in them all the passion of loyalty which youth has in its pure love and the patriot squanders gladly for his fatherland. They commended their gospel to the world not with the voice of deprecation, but with the confidence of a passionate faith. No other way: no other name: no other king!

The Church must regain that note if it is to be heard again by the world. Colourless, tame, trembling societies do not last. The gospel, with all its myriad points of contact with things human, with all its tenderness and sympathy, has nevertheless a challenge and a defiance, implicit in its very being. The Word of the Christian Church may be true or false, they say; but if any company of human beings believe it whole-heartedly they have no right to be apologetic. They must proclaim it proudly, with heads uplifted and voices straining to tell its glory. The Church will only regain its true pride by thinking more of its Lord, and His work and commission. The words used by Spenser of his love should be true of the Church:

In that proud port which her so goodly graceth,
While her fair face she rears up to the skies,
And to the ground her eyelids low embaseth,
Most goodly temperature ye may descry,
Mild humblesse mixt with awful majesty.

Such 'humblesse' may be blended still with the majesty and dignity of the Church, which is the Bride of Christ, and the Pillar and Ground of the Truth. Of all apologies for the Faith, the only ones to receive a hearing are the proud and fearless words of men or Churches which are not ashamed of their confession and do not shirk all that is involved in it.[3]

[1] E. White, *On Certainty in Religion*, 14.
[2] J. M. Hodgson, *Theologia Pectoris*, 89.
[3] *The Times*, 2nd February 1918, p. 9.

ADVENT SUNDAY.

'When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son.'—Gal 4[4].

St. Paul tells us here that the birth of the Redeemer and the manifestation of God's love in the Incarnation did not come haphazard. It came 'in the fulness of time,' and it is of the first advent of Christ and the preparation of the world for it that we would think to-day.

Let us first, then, consider the Time. It was the time when for the first time in its history the Pax Romana, or Roman Peace, gave rest to a world distracted by almost continuous war. From the accession of Augustus, about twenty years before the birth of Christ, to the year A.D. 230, when the Goths, Vandals, and other northern nations began

their attacks upon the Roman Empire, that is, for some two hundred and fifty years, peace reigned generally throughout the civilized world. There had been many great empires before that of Rome—Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Greek, and Phœnician—but none of them had ever succeeded in bringing about a world peace, nor has such a peace ever happened since in the history of the world. It is not a little remarkable, and cannot be accidental, that the birth of Christ happened at the beginning of this period, and that the preaching of the gospel was followed by this quiet time, which did so much to help forward its spread throughout the world. The Romans contributed to the spread of the gospel unconsciously in other ways. First by the magnificent roads which they built all over Europe, and in parts of the East. They were built on a six-foot foundation of rock and were perfectly straight. Many of them exist to this day in England. An excellent system of post-horses made travelling as quick and easy as it was anywhere, until the invention of the steam-engine, and a system of fast posting carried letters to all parts of the empire as quickly and more safely than mails were conveyed a hundred years ago. Intercommunication was also largely helped by the army system, under which recruits from all parts of the empire were constantly being transferred from one part to another. We know that many of the early Christian converts were soldiers, and especially officers, and they helped largely to spread the gospel. The system of appeals to Rome, of which St. Paul took advantage, also helped to circulate persons and intelligence from one part to another. The general decay of national religions, consequent on the conquests of Rome, which caused people to lose faith in the power of their national gods, was also a potent instrument in preparing the world for the coming of Christ. We know that there was a very general expectation of the coming of a world-Saviour testified to by the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil (in which he speaks of the expected birth of a Child in whom the golden age of happiness and innocence should be restored, and who was to be the moral regenerator of the world), as well as by the Sibylline Books and other writings.

Secondly, consider the people among whom Christ was born. It is said that Frederick the Great once asked his chaplain to give an argument for Christianity in a word, and that he replied, 'The Jews, your Majesty.' The Jews had had a unique training among all the peoples of the earth. Starting from a faith but little in advance of that of their other Semitic neighbours, they had developed a far more spiritual belief, at first in Jehovah as the local and national God of the Jews, and then, under the teaching of the great prophets, in Jehovah as the God of all mankind. They had not escaped contamination from the idolatry around them; but the lesson of the Captivity, by which their faithlessness was punished, sank deeply into their minds, and they returned from captivity purged from every trace of idolatry, and the most intensely monotheistic people in the world, with a noble ideal of the Majesty, Might, and Righteousness of God, and a religion not approached in spirituality by any faith in the world. It is obvious how such a people, reverencing their great evangelical prophets and looking forward to a long-promised Messiah, were peculiarly fitted to be the race whose nationality the promised Deliverer was to assume. God had trained them to be the spiritual teachers of the world.

Thirdly, note the country in which Christ was born. We might have expected that Christ would have been born at Rome with all the power and prestige of a Roman citizen; but in that case the Faith would have won its way by the might of human power, and not by its own intrinsic worth. Instead of that, Christ was born amid a poor and despised subject race, a byword and scorn of the polished Romans. Note again that He was born on the extreme Eastern confines of the West, and on the extreme Western confines of the East, just where East and West met, for He was to be, not a Western, nor an Eastern, but the perfect man, in whom East and West alike could find their perfect ideal of manhood. It is true that hitherto it is chiefly in the West that Christianity has developed, but there is much in the teaching of Christ that is more akin to, and more easily understood by, the people of the East, and when the East turns to Christ the Christian Church will be enriched and deepened by much that we people of the West have imperfectly understood or practised.

Fourthly, even the actual place of Christ's birth has its meaning and significance. Bethlehem was associated with all the memories of David, and the hope of a Messiah who was to spring off David's line. At the same time it was too near to Jerusalem for the bringing up of the Messiah. To come from

Jerusalem would, in its measure, be open to the same objections as coming from Rome. It would have meant close association with the minute observances of the Law, and identification with the narrow traditions of Jewish orthodoxy. Though Christ was born at Bethlehem, He was brought up at Nazareth far away in the country among simple hill folk. His training was not that of any particular school of thought, or political or social party. He was brought up simply as a man among men.

Lastly, consider the language in which the gospel was introduced to the world. The language spoken in Palestine was Aramaic, a form of Hebrew, but the language of educated men and also of business was Greek. It is very probable that most of the people were bilingual, as the people of England were, largely, after the Norman Conquest, or as the people of Wales are to-day. Anyhow, the gospel was promulgated not in Aramaic or Hebrew, not in Latin, the language of the dominant race, but in Greek, the language of the most intellectual race in the world, who had formed their language into the most perfect vehicle for the expression of human thought that the world has ever seen. The language which had been used by Plato and Aristotle to express the highest philosophy that the world had seen, and by Homer and Æschylus, Thucydides, and Demosthenes, to express the perfection of art, history, and eloquence was the language that was most suited to convey to the world the sublime truths of the gospel. When, later on, Greek was almost forgotten, and the truths of the gospel were conveyed to the world chiefly in Latin, the change was certainly not for the better, and showed the wisdom of God in seeing to it that the first and authentic proclamation of the gospel in its written form was in Greek. We may thus begin to understand how it was that Christ came 'in the fulness of time,' and how the three great nations of the world contributed each their share in the preparation of the world. The Jews gave their spiritual ideals and their intense belief in the greatness and majesty of God and the need of righteousness, the Romans their profound respect for law and their wonderful capacity for order and government, and the Greeks their incomparable language.

The thought cannot but rise in our minds, 'If God took such infinite trouble to prepare the world for the first coming of the Saviour, how is it that we are doing so little to prepare the world for the full coming of His Kingdom upon earth, and so little to prepare our own hearts and lives for that Second Coming when He shall return to judge the world, seated on the clouds and attended by the holy angels?' For that day may God prepare our hearts.[1]

Second Sunday in Advent.

Fall and Rise.

'Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel.'—Lk 2^{34}.

At the time referred to by these words, Joseph and Mary are seen presenting the infant Jesus in the Temple in recognition of the Lord's traditional right to the first-born male in every Hebrew home. The Benedictus had just been chanted, and the morning sacrifice offered, when an old man entered the court of the Jews. He was well known in Jerusalem as Simeon the Scribe, a devout student of the Scriptures. Inspired books needed inspired readers. Simeon knew how to read the Bible. Through the letter of prophecy foreshinings glowed of the advent of the 'Consolation of Israel.' The Coming was wrought into his brightest hopes, but he knew not when or where it would be. One day, however, touched by an excitement he could not explain, he went into the Temple and saw this peasant babe. Then a rush of revelation came to him as it comes to ready souls. 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.' At once, therefore, this old seer apprehended the meaning of the Child. Unhindered by His infancy, or the poverty of His parents, or the absence of heavenly demonstration, but like one entirely sure of the facts, he went without misgiving to the mother, and taking the Child in his arms muttered that Nunc Dimittis which has been the death-song of thousands, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared before the face of all people, a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel.' Turning to the mother, he said, 'Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign to be hated, and as a sword which shall pierce thy heart to its core.' What a tremendous forecast! What a mysterious burden the old man held in his arms! The common notion about Simeon is that when he had finished speaking, 'he was not, for God took him.' It might

[1] G. White, *Fifty-six Short Sermons*, 193.

well have been so, for the sight he obtained of the scope of Christ's ministry was like a vision of heavenly things denied to men in life, but sometimes granted to the dying—a rending of the veil, a brilliant apocalypse.

1. He is the touchstone to Israel.

(1) *Their fall.* The learned classes—the Scribes—would have nothing to say to Him. The political religionists—the Herodians—they too, would have nothing to say to Him. 'The common people heard him gladly' in the earlier days of His ministry, but the time came when they too cried out. 'Let him be crucified!' Only a few predestined souls clung to Him; others came near, without doing more; the great body fell away. St. Paul reviews the whole case in his Epistle to the Romans. Israel as a whole, he admits, had fallen. Only a remnant was left, as in the days of Elijah. As to the majority, they were weighed down by a spirit of slumber—'eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear.'

Religion does not save us by the mere fact of our being brought into intimate contact with it. Those who have known most about it in early youth, the sons of religious parents, sometimes turn out its worst enemies. They appear to speak with authority when they say that they have tried and found it wanting. They are like soldiers who, after making themselves perfectly acquainted with their general's resources and position, go over to the enemy and place their knowledge at his disposal. This sad sight, as many of us know, has been repeated in not a few conspicuous instances in this and the last generation, as well as in instances which are not conspicuous. Christ is set in the firmament of the spiritual heavens for the fall of these unhappy souls; He is to them 'a savour of death unto death.' He is ever in Himself loving and merciful, 'not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.' But in all generations there are souls of whom He says in sorrow, 'If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloke for their sin.' He is 'set,' against the tenor of His own Blessed Will, for the fall of many.

The rich young man who came to Him is a leading instance. His moral sense had drawn him to the Presence of Christ; he instinctively felt that here was a Teacher who could speak, at least, with that sort of authority which comes with goodness. He wished to be conscious of the entire approval of a Master like this, and so he submitted himself to an examination. He had kept the great commandments of the Law; he thought all was well with him: 'What lack I yet?' When our Lord laid on him the counsel to 'sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and come follow me,' he turned away sorrowful, for he had great possessions.

Somewhat different is a fall like that of Judas. Judas was already one of the chosen Twelve; yet he was also, in our Lord's words, 'A devil.' Judas fell through one besetting sin. But his covetousness, which might have worked only ordinary havoc on another theatre of events, was in that most sacred Presence nothing less than irretrievable ruin. The Presence of Christ was like the Moral Law; it stimulated into latent evil opposition to itself. Judas was irritated into treason by the tranquil unassailable Holiness with which he companioned day by day; but Judas fell, not merely from what he might have been but from what he had been. It would have been better for such a one not to have known the way of life. It would have been good for him if he had never been born.

There is a state of heart which naturally turns away from or hates the life of Christ and the spirit of its work. It may be reached through steady hypocrisy, which, being a lie, hates truth; through steady self-seeking, which cannot see God, for it only sees itself; through steady clinging to sin, which, living in hell, loves absence from God; through steady lightness and irreverence, which abhors the solemnities of righteous doing. That state of heart cannot recognize Christ. His voice is strange and dull or jars on the ear as hateful. There is no kinship between Him and it. When His goodness is flashed upon such men, it sends them into violent hatred of it. He is set for their fall. But it is their own deeds that have brought them to that condition, not God's will. This is the condemnation—that men loved darkness rather than light: why?—because their deeds were evil.

(2) *Their rising.* 'Risen with Christ' is an expression applied by St. Paul to Christians on this side of the grave; and the 'rising of many in Israel' was not the future resurrection of the body, but the present moral and spiritual resurrection of the soul. Something like this power is exerted upon us, but in an infinitely restricted sense, by eminently good men; they do by their mere presence, their looks, their words, their unconscious

ways, draw those of us who are privileged to be with them upwards towards that world in which they habitually live. In our Lord's case, while He was on earth, this power which went out of Him was unlike any witnessed before or since; and He exerts it still, though from the invisible world, and through agencies which appeal less powerfully to imagination, or rather, to sense.

The Gospels tell us of several for whose 'rising again' Christ was set. It was true of each disciple that persevered. It was conspicuously true of the Magdalen, whom He rescued from the grasp of seven devils; and of Peter, who denied Him; and of Thomas, who would not for awhile believe His Word. But in none of His servants is this attractive power of the Redeemer, mighty to raise from sin and death, more gloriously displayed than in St. Paul. St. Paul had 'fallen' so as to be, in his own estimate, the very 'chief of sinners.' He had been a blasphemer and a persecutor; he was not, he felt, even in later years, when he had long worked and suffered, meet to be called an Apostle, because he persecuted the Church of God. But if our Lord provoked in him at first a bitter hostility, the time came when He inspired His fanatical opponent with a passionate affection which controlled all the faculties of his being. The point at which this great change took place is called his 'conversion'; in Simeon's language, it was his 'rising again' after his 'fall.' Thus, in his own person, St. Paul experienced this double effect of the Advent of Christ into the world; first, the repulsion, which made him so bitter a persecutor; and next, the attraction, which made him so glorious an Apostle. First the fall, then the resurrection.

2. He is the touchstone to the Gentiles also. Do you ask, What has this Child to do with the fortunes of men? He is said to be 'set for the fall and rising again.' 'Set' as, *e.g.*, a doctor sets a test to determine a patient's temperature. 'Set' as a plumb is set against the mason's work to test its perpendicular. 'Set' as a foundation stone, or the keystone of an arch. 'Set,' *i.e.*, so as to be authoritatively and vitally connected with man's fate in every department of his life. How is He thus significantly 'set' in the centre of human life? It is truly a marvellous suggestion. We are thinking, remember, about an actual life. It would be easier to construct a perfect creed than to grow a perfect life. No; no man is good enough to be a spiritual test, true to every man and all latitudes. But that which Christ is entitled to claim is this—that with Him more or less has no meaning. Listen to the verdict of the Eternal Father: 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.' No one landscape contains all nature's beauties; no one life embodies the fulness of truth and grace—infinite hate of sin, infinite love of goodness, together with infinite pity for wrong-doers, and an infinite yearning to lead their feet into the way of peace. But Christ's life did and does. 'In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' He is law perfected in love, and love justified by law. He has lived on the topmost heights of Divine righteousness, and in the lowliest vales of human temptibility. He is the Word of God, by His life 'quick and powerful, piercing to the dividing asunder of the joints and marrow, and is a searcher of the thoughts and intents of the heart'; but He is also a Great High Priest who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Like us He has been in all points tempted; like God He has never sinned; and like Himself He is able at once to rebuke sin, and 'succour them that are tempted.' His rightness therefore is unique and complete. Now in measuring and weighing such a character as this, is it not fair to say that if men do not love a rightness like Christ's there must be something wrong not with Him but them? Can a man be disloyal to Christ and yet loyal to righteousness? Is it possible to love the sunshine, and yet hate the sun? Considering how completely inseparable perfect goodness and Christ are, it comes at last to this, that He is 'set' like a spiritual zöometer in our midst so absolutely that the measure of our goodness is determined by the measure in which we absorb His Spirit, and reflect the beauty of His life. As the Religious One, the transcendent pattern of the religious life, and the inspirer of the religious spirit, Christ has the right to touch everything, and 'try every man's work of what sort it is.'

There came a man, whence, none could tell,
Bearing a touchstone in his hand;
And tested all things in the land
By its unerring spell.

And lo, what sudden changes smote
The fair to foul, the foul to fair!
Purple nor ermine did he spare,
Nor scorn the dusty coat.

Of heirloom jewels prized so much
Many were changed to chips and clods,
And even statues of the gods
Crumbled beneath its touch.

When angrily the people cried,
'The loss outweighs the profit far,
Our goods suffice us as they are,
We will not have them tried.'

And since they could not so avail
To check his unrelenting quest
They seized him saying, 'Let him test
How real is our jail.'

But though they slew him with a sword
And in a fire his touchstone burned,
Its doings could not be o'erturned
Its undoings restored.

It is a solemn thing to watch a man when that testing comes to him. A duty is laid before him, its goodness clear as the day. A sorrow darkens his life, a trial rushes or steals to meet him; and in the sorrow or the trial, what is right and loving is unmistakable. The hour strikes when he is called on to choose between two ways of acting, and he knows God is in one, and the devil in the other. What is this? It is Christ set before him for his rise or fall; Christ comes to reveal his inward thoughts, his inward strength or weakness. It is a judgment hour; and years of evil, or of righteous growth, rest upon the hour.

Contributions and Comments.

Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon.

McGIFFERT'S THEORY.

TAKING for granted what is now generally admitted—that the ministry in the local Church was the result of a gradual development during the first sixty years of Christianity—we set ourselves the task of discovering the course of this development. As we examine the writings of the New Testament in pursuit of this task we are conscious that we have very little firm ground under our feet. As far as real history is concerned, we have one book which covers only the first thirty years of the period in question. Beyond this we are dependent upon a number of letters, which of course are not generally concerned with Church organization, and, when they do touch upon it, assume a knowledge of the subject on the part of the recipients, which knowledge may be the very key we require to make things plain for ourselves. Moreover, it is impossible for us to be certain of the exact dates of the documents we are dealing with, and this is important for our inquiry.

The Acts knows only 'presbyters' and 'bishops' so far as official titles are concerned, for there is no mention of 'deacons.' Many of St. Paul's letters are silent on the question, though we cannot assume from this that local ministries were unknown in the Churches to which he wrote. The circular letter known as Ephesians speaks of 'pastors' and 'teachers' who may belong to the local as opposed to the general ministry. The pastorals know 'bishops,' 'presbyters,' 'deacons,' and possibly 'deaconesses' and 'widows.' Philippians is most definite with its 'bishops and deacons.' Outside the Pauline canon Hebrews speaks of 'rulers,' and St. James and St. Peter of 'presbyters.'

At the close of the tunnel period we have the Johannine writings, which give us little help towards the solution of the problem. Nothing can be argued from the 'angel' in the Apocalypse, and the second and third epistles speak only of 'presbyters.' Beyond this there is a hint in the third epistle of a kind of *primus inter pares* among a group of presbyters, who was wrongly exercising the power of excommunication.

Outside the New Testament the Didache is as definite as the Philippian epistle in emphasizing 'bishops and deacons,' and Clement speaks of 'bishops,' 'presbyters,' and 'deacons.'

Putting on one side the less frequent terms, 'rulers,' 'pastors,' and 'teachers,' we have three words, ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, and διάκονος. As used in the first-century writings, do they represent three offices, or are ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος identical? If they are identical, in what sense are they so? The first of these questions we can regard as settled, for it is now generally conceded

that there are not three but two offices referred to in first-century writings. It is the second question which presents the greater problem. Eusebius seems to have been aware that in some sense 'bishop' and 'presbyter' were identical in the first century.[1] It is this riddle of the two names for one office which needs solution. It will not do to say that 'presbyter' is confined to Jewish Churches, and 'bishop' arose in Gentile Churches; for in the latter Churches we have both terms used. In what sense, then, was the bishop identical with the presbyter?

I wish only to examine the theory put forward by McGiffert, who claims that 'presbyter' was a general term including both 'bishop' and 'deacon'—a term something like our modern use of 'minister.'[2] McGiffert claims that he was led to this theory by the fact that Harnack points out that passages showing a distinction between 'presbyter' and 'bishop' are very early. This Harnack suggested—and McGiffert agrees—was proof that from the beginning there was a difference of some sort. In passing it may be pointed out that the conclusion is not really justified. Early passages showing a difference do not necessarily point to a difference *from the beginning*. This early difference may have been connected with Jewish and Gentile usage.

I admit that all the passages in the New Testament lend themselves to interpretation along the lines of McGiffert's theory, but the point is they can be interpreted apart from his theory, and this is in itself a warning to be cautious in accepting it. McGiffert further argues that, if he is right, we are to expect the *general* term to be used before the *particular* terms, and this is exactly what we find in Acts. But I cannot feel that Ac 20^{17-38} reads as smoothly when interpreted along the lines of his theory as when we regard all the presbyters of Ephesus as being bishops, rather than some bishops and some deacons. Of course those who regard 'the seven,' in Ac 6, as deacons have an easy argument against the theory; for they will say, 'the deacon is earlier than the presbyter'; but I cannot myself take this view. The Acts seems to know nothing of 'deacons,' although there were 'bishops' at Ephesus—that is, the name was in use. This fact leans in a direction away from McGiffert's theory, but does not disprove it.

McGiffert further points out that, if his theory is true, we should expect to find the general term and the specific terms used in *the same context*; but we should never have the general term and one of the specific terms *co-ordinated*. Thus, we should never find 'presbyter and bishop' or 'presbyter and deacon,' but we should expect to find 'bishops and deacons.' This exactly works out in the case of the New Testament. There is no doubt that this theory fits the facts as we find them in the New Testament, the Didache, and Clement,[3] so far as the combination of the names goes; but it is difficult to forget that the New Testament writers most frequently use διάκονος, λειτουργός, and ὑπηρέτης, when they wish to speak in general terms, and Clement uses a form of λειτουργός when referring to ministry in general. If πρεσβύτερος was a wide term covering more than one kind of ministry, we should expect to find it used in some of the passages where we now have λειτουργός, διάκονος, or ὑπηρέτης. Moreover, it is strange that we have not a single instance of the term 'presbyter' used as identical with the official term 'deacon.' Again, whilst it is quite likely that St. Peter would speak of himself as a 'fellow-presbyter' ('fellow-minister' in our sense) in addressing a number of 'presbyters' ('ministers' in our sense) of two different grades, yet the passage in question[4] does seem to give to all these presbyters the powers of oversight and shepherding, and fits better the theory that all presbyters were bishops. Further, 1 Ti 5^{17} might be made to harmonize with McGiffert's theory, 'the elders that rule' being taken for a small body of bishops inside the general body of presbyters; but it should be noted that it is not a question of some elders ruling and others not. They all rule, but some rule *well*. Did deacons then also rule? McGiffert, I think, would claim they did, but such a claim lacks historical support. Then in Titus presbyters were to be appointed in every city, but the only qualifications given are those for the office of bishop; and Titus is written at a period when Church organization was at a fairly high stage of development, even if we accept the date of

[1] *H.E.* iii. 23.

[2] See McGiffert's *Eusebius*. Note on p. 150. The theory had very little vogue in this country at the time it was put forward, but questions of Church Government are again to the fore, and the theory is again attracting attention.

[3] Clement to Corinthians, ch. 44.

[4] 1 P. 5^{1-4}.

conservative critics. The Pauline Churches knew bishops and deacons. Why should the epistle give us the general name and then speak of one particular class inside this general ministry and not of the other? If 'presbyter' was a general name, and 'bishops' and 'deacons' arose out of the presbyters, then so soon as bishops were constituted in any body of presbyters so soon would deacons arise as the residue of presbyters who did not become bishops. The rise of 'bishops' and 'deacons' should be simultaneous, but everything points to the fact that the diaconate was a later development.

But the strongest argument against McGiffert's theory is in the fact that what he says could not happen, if his theory is correct, actually does happen. He says 'we could never find "presbyter and bishop," "presbyter and deacon," but we should expect to find the specific terms thus co-ordinated, "bishops and deacons."' This works out so far as the New Testament is concerned, but in Polycarp we actually get one of these combinations which McGiffert regards as impossible if his theory is true: 'being subject to the presbyters and deacons.'[1] This is an epistle written to the only Church which in the New Testament is addressed as having 'bishops and deacons,' and it is difficult to put any other interpretation on the facts than the one that 'presbyters and deacons' in Polycarp is equivalent to 'bishops and deacons' in St. Paul, and that 'presbyter' is identical with 'bishop,' but not with 'bishop + deacon.'

The significant thing is, I think, that we never get the combination 'presbyters and bishops,' but we do get 'presbyters and deacons'; that we never get 'presbyter' and 'deacon' used interchangeably in a single passage, though we frequently get 'presbyter' and 'bishop' so used. Everything, therefore, seems to point to the fact, which has been generally conceded, that 'presbyter' and 'bishop' are at first interchangeable terms, and that 'deacon' represents a lower order of the ministry: or, in other words, to the fact that the earliest form of local ministry was one of two orders, presbyters (bishops) and deacons, and not one of two orders included in the presbyters thus:

Presbyters = Bishops + Deacons.

W. ROBINSON.

Overdale College, Moseley, Birmingham.

[1] Polycarp to the Philippians, v.

The Angel of God.

IN reference to the article which appeared in the May number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES headed 'The Angel of God, or God the King,' the following observations may be of interest:

First, it should be observed that the two words, the one for 'angel' or 'messenger' and the other for 'king,' are not so similar as might be supposed by any one who judged by the way they were transliterated in the article. 'Malach' and 'Melech' seem the same, except for the vowels, and we know that the Hebrew vowel pointing is of recent date. But, in reality, the words are not so similar, since the word for angel or messenger has an א which does not occur in the word for king—thus—מלאך (messenger): מלך (king). It is a curious thing, however, that this א has been inserted in the word for kings in 2 S 11^{1}, 'the time when kings go forth to war.' This is due to an error of a transcriber, and may indicate that the words were unintentionally altered in the few places where such alteration may have taken place. One such passage was mentioned in the article, though it should be pointed out that in 1 Ch 21^{20} the LXX reads 'king' instead of the Hebrew 'angel,' 'angel' being evidently a mistake, as the reading 'king' corresponds with 2 S 24^{20}, and refers to David.

In their origin the two words are almost of opposite meaning. מָלַךְ, meaning to 'reign,' is cognate with the Syriac word meaning to 'consult.' In contrast with this, the word from which 'angel' or 'messenger' comes, לָאַךְ, is the same as the Ethiopic word which means to be sent as a messenger, to be sent to wait upon, or to be a servant. So then the two words mean—*the King Who serves!* How different to the idea of God as an Eastern despot. The way was being prepared for 'the Servant of the Lord,' Who girded Himself and washed the disciples' feet, and said, 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.'

The article is ingenious, yet all the facts of the case are met by acknowledging that there may have been some confusion due to the similarity of the two words, but that both words show a true conception of Jehovah, 'the Angel of the Lord' being the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, Who was 'the Word of God,' and appeared and spoke to man before He was born of the Virgin Mary.

HERBERT CROSSLAND.

Houghton Vicarage, Carlisle.

Entre Nous.

TWO TEXTS.

Heb. xi. 13.

We say of a man in praise of him that 'he is as good as his word.' And a fine thing it is to have earned such praise. But what the Bible says of God is that 'He is better than His word.' You may break your word, that is, if you break it in order to do something better. You must not go *back* on your word.[1]

---

2 Co 3[18].—'But we all with unveiled face, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory.'

In these words the temporary reflection of the Shekinah in Moses' face is contrasted with the permanent and complete illumination of the Spirit. They form the climax of a passage which, full of mystery and splendour, leads us up to those things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard—to that beatific Vision prepared for God's unfeigned lovers, who shall shine with His own likeness because and when they 'see Him as He is.'

St. Paul's inspired and inspiring words bring back to mind the swift upward movement of Dante's *Paradiso*, where the spirit mounts from sphere to sphere, from glory to glory, impelled and wafted by the sheer force of Love, till at last, in face of the Triune blessedness, it is plunged into an ineffable joy and wonder—ineffable because, as he says, 'as it draweth nigh to its ideal, the object of its longing, our intellect sinketh so deep that memory cannot go back upon the track.'[2]

SOME TOPICS.

The Book of Ruth.

Few are the men whose sermons will stand the cost of publishing now. One of the few is Dr. John A. Hutton. He gets all his sermons published—the publishers apparently running after him for them. This season's first volume is called *The Victory over Victory* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). The meaning and application of that title you may think about and settle. It is enough here to refer to one sermon and one illustration in it. The sermon is on the Book of Ruth. No, it is not. It began to be but ended without being. And is so much rarer on that account. But this is the illustration:

'I remember, away back in my boyhood, sitting in church one summer morning. It was a scene typical of those days. A well-filled house, the people hushed and docile, taking part in matters which in the nature of things were for the most part beyond them, as indeed they are for the most part beyond us all. The preacher, a grave figure, well on in years, speaking with authority and sobriety—I do not know of what. But everything was as it should be, for even after all those years I recall it as a good and serious hour. But what distinguishes that day from all others in my recollection is this, that suddenly a great cream-coloured butterfly began to play about the old man's head. It did not trouble him, as men of our nervous and self-conscious time would have been troubled. For why, indeed, should it trouble him? There were few organs in those days; there was none there, and the butterfly took the place of the Anthem and the Gloria, supporting the old man's thesis, I have no doubt, as I should have known had I been old enough to know anything.

'The Book of Ruth is a butterfly blown in from the Garden of the Lord. There it darts and flickers amid the solemnities of the context, heedless of the thunders of Sinai and the rise and fall of Judges and Kings, singing the Lord's Song in a strange land, disposing us to forget the disheartening things that are obvious; and all this, not idly, but honourably, by falling back upon other things which will be here when we are gone, and when the Irish question has been settled, and when Russia has forgotten the horrors of her late delirium, and battleships will be seen only in drawings and models in museums of antiquities. "If you would have your songs endure, build on the human heart." "Ruth" is built plumb on the human heart.'

That Sixpence.

'The extraordinary idea, originated and maintained by Cockney comic papers and Cockney music-halls, that the Scot is a mean fellow to whom the spending of a sixpence is pain, is about as wide of the truth as it is possible for a popular fallacy

[1] J. A. Hutton, *The Victory over Victory*, 41.
[2] L. Ragg, *Dante Alighieri*, 1.

to reach. In my experience, which is considerable, the Scot, in the matter of generosity, is distinctly ahead of either the English, the Welsh, or the Irish; but he is a hater of waste and loves driving a hard bargain. In no section of the British Isles, outside of Scotland, have I come across men of the humbler classes who will do one laborious service without any expectation of reward. I have met that spirit in Western America and Western Canada, but nowhere in the British Isles except in Scotland. The outstanding generosity of the Scot is always in full evidence on the occasion of any national subscription for charitable or patriotic purposes. On such occasions Glasgow's contribution is invariably ahead of that of any other town in the kingdom.

'I was at one time, for a year or two, a regular attendant at the Scotch Presbyterian Church in Pont Street. When it so happened that Dr. M'Leod was called upon to make a charitable appeal from the pulpit, the response was such as absolutely to stagger one who was only accustomed to the miserly silver and copper offerings with which the pious besprinkle the plates in English churches. It was rare at St. Columba's to see anything less than gold, while five-pound notes and cheques rose in such disorderly profusion from the plate that, in the end, the substratum of gold was completely hidden. Think of that, you comic-paper artists, who think twice before putting sixpence in the plate!'[1]

Sin and Conservatism.

'The one department of human activity in which there has been no progress is sin. There are only ten commandments, and having broken them there is nothing to do but to break them again. In all other directions the race has improved; for we have railways instead of horses, typewriters instead of quills, steam radiators for open fires, not to mention washing-machines, telephones, matches, democracies, soda-water, rubber heels, and hatpins. But men are getting drunk nowadays on Clark Street, Chicago, and in the lobster palaces of Broadway, New York, and along the Boulevard Poissonière, in Paris, just about as Noah did when he stepped from the ark and found the bottle. The painted ladies of our day have hardly improved upon Thais, Lais & Company. The modern murderer goes about his work very much after the manner of Cain; the latest domestic scandals in Kansas City or Pittsburgh follow the lines of David or the wife of Marcus Aurelius; and the liars and thieves of Chicago and St. Louis have advanced none beyond Ananias and Judas.

'Hell is objectionable principally because it is such a bore. People go there in droves, each because the other goes. When a man starts for heaven he has to break away and fight, and consequently amounts to something. The longer I live the more I am amazed at the limited intelligence that can keep interested in wickedness, and the more I marvel at the sheer creative genius and resourcefulness needed in just being good.'

That short essay is taken from Dr. Frank Crane's new volume. It is a fair example. The reference to 'getting drunk' seems to be out of date, but that does not affect the essay. The variety of topic in the volume, of which the title is *Human Confessions* (John Lane; 6s. net), is very great. And although Dr. Crane is a Doctor of Divinity they are not treated theologically. Nor are they always ethical. The best of them all are the long addresses to boys. These addresses have in them the making of many children's sermons.

Fuller's Soap.

'When Mr. Peck came to Whale River, he endeavoured to institute a reform along the lines of a well-known proverb. He conceived the heroic project of inducing the Eskimos to wash, a thing they had never thought of doing in their lives. With this end in view, he gathered some of the men in his own little room, initiated them into the mysteries of the art, and then left them alone for a while. On his return he was unable to discover a single "shining face" among them, yet, strange to say, scarcely a vestige of the large piece of soap remained. By dint of cross-examination he found out that this had been divided amongst them and eaten!'[2]

Marrying, yes, but giving in Marriage?

'The trip had been a very trying one in every way, and my fiancée had suffered greatly. When we were walking up to the fort one of Mrs. Spencer's little girls rushed into the house to her mother, and

[1] Lord Ernest Hamilton, *Forty Years On*, 144.

[2] J. Lofthouse, *A Thousand Miles from a Post Office*, 14.

said, "Oh, mother, what a narrow wife," meaning how very thin and poorly my future wife looked. In talking over affairs that night, a peculiar dilemma arose. Very briefly it was this. Mr. Winter, who we had also expected was coming out by the ship, had not arrived; his wife had been ill and his furlough had been extended. Who was to marry us? I was the only minister in the whole of that north country. The young lady was very naturally greatly troubled at this state of affairs after a journey of 3000 miles in a small whaler. She asked me if there was not, at least, a Methodist minister within reach who could tie the knot. I told her there certainly was, but unfortunately he was quite 700 miles away, a six weeks' journey without any possibility of returning for, at least, a year. To this she replied, if that was the case, the only possible course was for her to return to England as she had come. This plan I most emphatically vetoed. "Here you are," I said, "and here you will remain; if there is no other way out I shall perform the ceremony myself." This I knew had been done before in the north, and I was quite willing to test the legality of the question if there was no other way out of the difficulty.' [1]

NEW POETRY.

F. Crawford Burkitt.

Did you know that Professor Burkitt was a poet? Of poetry of his own he may have a drawerful. Meantime he has rendered *Ecclesiastes* into English verse (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. cloth, 6d. paper). Take the Prologue for example (Ec 1^{2-11}), noticing that he prefers 'bubble' to 'vanity,' and gives good reasons in the Preface for his preference.

Bubble of bubbles! All things are a Bubble!
What is the use of all Man's toil and trouble?
Year after year the Crop comes up and dies,
The Earth remains, Mankind is only Stubble.

The rising Sun will set and rise once more;
The Wind goes roving round from Shore to Shore,
From North to South it goes, and round and round,
And back again to where it was before.

All rivers run into the Sea we know,
And yet the Sea doth never overflow;
Back to the place from whence their Waters came
By unknown Channels must the Rivers go.

The weary Round continues as begun,
The Eye sees naught effective to be done.
Nor does the Ear hear aught to satisfy—
There's nothing, nothing New under the Sun.

Something (they tell us) really New at Last!
Why, surely, it was known in Ages past;
The Memory has faded, that is all,
And all our Lore will vanish just as fast.

Anita Moor.

Sonnets, by Anita Moor (Constable; 5s.). Arnold Bennett declares: 'It is impossible to put music into words.' But that is what Mrs. Moor has done; and more than that, into sonnets. Some of the sonnets are descriptions of her husband's works, she tells us, some of them are 'only the passing pictures they awakened in one listener's mind.' Well, we have not the music here, but we have the words. We have the poetry—as this on the

STABAT MATER.

Beside the foot of Christ's most lonely Cross,
Her weeping soul pierced by the sword of grief,
The Mother stands, afflicted in her loss,
Helpless to give her dying Son relief.
O tender Mother, see we bring our tears!
We lift our voice with many a fervent sigh!
Tormented, torn, and mocked by scoffs and jeers,
Forsaken in His grief she sees Him die.
Great Virgin, fount of Love! By Jesus' death
Give us of burning love and grief our share.
O Jesus! grant that after our last breath
The palms of victory in our hand we bear.
Saved from the flame of wrath that never dies,
Grant us the glory of Thy Paradise!

Marian Hockliffe.

Five poets—F. S. Robinson, Emily Upcott, Lewis E. Upcott, Marian Hockliffe, and E. Hockliffe—have together formed *A Rhymer's Ring* (Blackwell; 6s. net.). The volume is artistically bound and deserves the art and interest spent on

[1] J. Lofthouse, *A Thousand Miles from a Post Office*, 50 f.

it. Pleasant would it be to quote one poem from each of the five poets, but this, and a short one it is, must be taken as taste of the feast awaiting those who read the volume:

IN THE FEN COUNTRY.

There in the wide, far-spreading fields it lies,
A pool of water; neither tree nor reed
Is near to lend its beauty, but its face,
Turned smiling upward, gathers from the skies
Their daily splendour, and in very deed
Brings down God's Heaven to earth. So by His grace
Eyes that gaze upward win a deeper hue,
Refluence of glory hidden 'neath the blue.

G. A. Studdert-Kennedy.

The Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy, the author of *Rough Rhymes of a Padre* and other books of the kind, has now published *Songs of Faith and Doubt* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net.), which, in spite of its title, is also somewhat of the same kind. Especially so, the Bolshevist's Speech:

Be kind, contented, honest citizens;
Come into church and hear the parson preach,
And do as you are told, then when you die
You shall sit on a golden throne and play
An angel's harp. Just think of that when cold
And hungry you creep off to bed at night.
Such thoughts will surely keep you warm and feed
Your kids.

And much more. There is then the Christian answer:

He knows the weekly wage
That will not buy them bread, the empty grate
Whereon no kettle sings. He understands
Love's bitterness, and even thro' fierce hate
Can hear Love call, and see its helpless hands
Held up in prayer. God was a man. He knows.
And lo! the answer comes, the spirit moves
Upon the waters of the world. Love grows
To grace, and growing breaks the ancient grooves
Thro' which it ran to waste. A larger hope,
A wider vision dawns upon man's thought.
I see a million hands held out to grope
Their way into the light, the light that fought
The powers of darkness when the living Word
Took human flesh.

NEW POETRY.

Arthur Melville Clark.

Is Mr. Arthur Melville Clark, M.A., a poet? He is a critic of poets. He has written a book on *The Realistic Revolt in Modern Poetry* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). His charges are two. First the realistic poets are contemptuous of tradition. This charge he illustrates from Mr. Orrick Johns:

This is the song of youth,
This is the cause of myself;
I knew my father well and he was a fool,
Therefore will I have my own foot in the path before I take a step;
I will only go into new lands,
And I will walk on no plank-walks,
The horses of my family are wind-broken,
And the dogs are old,
And the guns rusty;
I will make me a new bow from an ash-tree,
And cut up the homestead into arrows.

The other charge is that the realism of the modern poet is not poetry. Mr. Clark insists that poetry must lift up. Some modern realistic poets deliberately drag down, while some leave us where we were. The illustration here is from Mr. Sandburg. It is part of a long description of an American 'city':

a spot on the map
And the passenger trains stop there
And the factory smokestacks smoke
And the grocery stores are open Saturday nights
And the streets are free for citizens who vote
And inhabitants counted in the census.
Saturday night is the big night.
Main street runs through the middle of the town,
And there is a dirty post office
And a dirty city hall
And a dirty railroad station.

H. Lang Jones.

Mr. Lang Jones in *The Outer Courts* (Blackwell; 4s. 6d.) is much interested in those primary sources of poetry which we call the senses. He

sees, he hears, and especially is he thankful that he smells.

Life wouldn't be life without all these;
And, Sir, when it comes to a *rose*—
Why, it makes you want to go down on your knees,
And thank God for your nose!

So whatever he is he is original. He sees for himself, hears, touches, tastes, smells for himself. And yet it is he that writes this:

PLAGIARISM.

These thoughts I seek to clothe in rhyme—
Are they my own?
To none have they occurred in time
Save me alone?
Do I but copy patterns wrought
By hands more deft?
Will men detect in this my thought
Unwitting theft?

Thus musing on a summer eve
Beneath the sky,
Comforting answer I receive
From moon on high:
'Am I less lovely in your sight,'
I think she says,
'Because I shed on you the light
Of borrowed rays?'

J. H. Corby.

Although Mr. Corby is a philosopher—see his poem on 'The Passion of Life':

The nightingale, whose voice doth start
Across the dark so full and sweet,
She hath no passion in her heart,
But happiness complete.
'Tis in the listening poet's breast there stirs
The breath of passion, and he calls it hers.

Though he is a philosopher, we say, he writes easily and simply. Thus:

THREE KINDS OF MORTAL MAN.

Three kinds of mortal man there be,
Children of heaven, earth, and hell.
The fortune-favoured do not see,
But those in trouble know them well.

One kind sees you, his fellow-man,
Thigh-deep in sorrow or in sin,
And runs as quickly as he can
To shove you down and tread you in.

The next, more mercifully made,
(And most of all the race are these),
In office hours will give you aid—
Chiefly advice—for proper fees.

But real, though rare, is kind the third,
Who—may God's mercy keep him whole!—
By inward impulse queerly stirred
Will leave his lunch to save your soul.

The title of the book is *Out of the Forest* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net).

Amy Key Clarke.

A true poet undoubtedly is Miss Clarke. The title is *Poems* (Blackwell; 4s. 6d. net) and the book deserves that proud title. Take this:

SECOND THOUGHTS.

'All men are poets,' though their lips
Are schooled to shame of poetry,
As, bound to shore, the seagull dips
No plume above the rolling sea.

'All men are lovers.' Though askance
They gaze on heavenly love of old,
His quenchless fire and laughter dance
Behind their crooked eyes and cold.

'All men are dreamers'—though the dream
Is shorn of wings, attired and shod,
And on the highway dares not seem
To have beheld the face of God.

The poet, lover, Christ in man
A thousand times condemned to die,
Declares it true since time began—
'All men are what they crucify.'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Yours very sincerely
James Hastings.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his second volume of *Outspoken Essays*, just published, Dean Inge discusses frankly his own faith. It is the most interesting essay in the book, and one of the most interesting parts of it deals with the belief in a future existence.

The attitude of the average church-goer on this question is described by the Dean in caustic language. 'Our contemporaries desire a religion without a hell; and they even seem to prefer a religion without a heaven . . . these people, as a class, have hopes in Christ, but in this life only. Christianity for them is mainly an instrument of social reform.' The attempt to realize an earthly millennium has been tried in Russia, and the result has been an Inferno such as the world has never seen before.

But the popular traditional notions of the future are not much better, ideas of a geographical heaven and hell, and of rewards in a city with streets of gold or of punishment in a super-heated furnace. These ideas are condemned on two grounds. In the first place, they are not good enough to be true. The belief in a future which has self-regard as its motive is not religious at all. True faith is belief in the reality of absolute values, like Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, and that faith means that we have our part in the eternal life of God.

Again, the advance of science has made the old eschatological frame-work untenable. Curiously enough it was not Darwin or Lyell who struck the blow, but Copernicus and Galileo in the time of the Renaissance. If the earth is a planet revolving round the sun, and if the solar system is only a speck in infinite space, the old geographical heaven and hell must be abandoned. There is no religious topography; there is no particular place where God lives. 'Here then we have a plain case in which traditional teaching is flatly contradictory to the facts of science, and also ethically revolting. Can we be surprised that it has lost all power to influence conduct or command real credence?'

The curious thing is that these notions have persisted in spite of the fact that the New Testament gives no ground for them. Dean Inge thinks that Jesus really revived the prophetic tradition, and did not attach Himself to the recent apocalyptists. Christ dwelt very little on the future state, and His one argument for immortality is, 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for we all live unto him.' And that is not an argument for resurrection or survival, but for eternal life. In Paul, too, the dominant idea is life according to the Spirit. This is a present experience, a higher state of being, exalted above time.

The 'unknown Fourth Evangelist' in his inspired interpretation of the Person and significance of

Christ, addressed to the third generation of Christians, gives us a sublimely idealized version of Paul's teaching. The Johannine writings are the best commentary we have on St. Paul's Epistles, and in them the great word is Life which is necessarily eternal. In the Fourth Gospel, the Way, the Truth, and the Life are an ascending scale of values. Such life, in Von Hügel's words, 'means for its possessor beatitude.' In its ethical relation it is an accompaniment of moral obedience. And with respect to knowing, it is enlightenment. The right to speak about eternal values—the right even to believe in them—must be earned by strict self-discipline. 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.'

Do you know Baron Friedrich von HÜGEL, who wrote *Eternal Life: A Study of its Implications and Applications* (T. & T. Clark), also *The Mystical Element of Religion*, and is soon, we hope, to issue an important work on religious fundamentals? If not, get his volume of *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion* (Dent). It is a revelation of many things, not least of the author, who is one of those most worth knowing in our time.

Three points stand out. First, there is his amazing acquaintance with theological literature of all schools and in all its branches. He has Biblical Criticism at his finger-ends, and discriminates and selects with sure touch. He knows Troeltsch, about whom too many of us are shamefully ignorant; his fifty pages of exposition of that new force in Christian thought would alone make this book invaluable. In Scotland he knows such men as Robertson Smith, Pringle-Pattison, and Professor Cairns. Speaking generally, he knows everybody of any consequence in the sphere of philosophical and religious thought.

Second, there are the massiveness, clearness, and suggestiveness of his own thinking.

Third, there is the beautiful Christian character revealed in the exquisite sympathy with which he expounds and evaluates views divergent from his own. Even when he has to be critical he remains courteous and kindly.

He is a great scholar, a great thinker, and a great Christian. That he is a convinced Roman Catholic is an incident. Not altogether without importance. For you simply cannot dare to preach on such a topic as Purgatory unless you have considered his view of it.

That the thought of Purgatory has in recent times been more favourably regarded among Protestants is undoubted. Not only did the War foster its growth by its suggestion of wistful anxieties as to the destiny of the multitude, not very definitely Christian either in faith or life, who at the opening of responsible manhood were in a moment hurled into eternity. But the break up of belief in Hell in favour of some sort of Purgatory was in operation before that. To a great number the alternative is no longer Heaven or Hell, but Heaven or Purgatory.

Against that too easy solution of the problem as to destiny beyond this life our author cautions us by sober, arresting, and weighty argument. He believes in Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory.

His argument for the necessity of a Purgatory is this. All acknowledge that very few men, if any, are at death quite fit for Heaven. The Protestant view is that by the Grace of God for Christ's sake the souls of believers are instantaneously made perfect in holiness. That, he argues, is contrary to all our experience of what the Grace of God does for a man in this life. The efficacy of Grace is undoubted, but it works according to ascertainable rule. Sanctification takes time, often a long time. Grace given in response to Faith and Repentance does not deliver a sinner from the necessity of a slow working out of his system of the physical consequences of vice. Nor does it deliver him at a stroke from a slow and

painful working out of his character of evil tendencies. There is thus absolutely nothing in our experience to suggest or to support a view of an instantaneous deliverance and perfecting. Final victory through Grace is sure: all the same the battle has to be fought out step by step. Hence the need of Purgatory.

But Purgatory is not Hell. On the latter topic our author's views deserve very serious consideration. Few preachers nowadays teach a clear doctrine of Hell. Preaching in consequence has lost a great deal of the note of poignant urgency. A sense of the tremendous issues of this life has been diminished. Von Hügel knows and takes account of all the arguments against the conceivability of eternal loss. But over against them all he would have us set two considerations. He asks only that we should weigh them well.

First, Heaven and Hell go together in the New Testament, and nowhere more impressively than in the teaching of Christ. Unless in this life men have to face a tremendous alternative, unless their choice involves the most solemnizing consequences, unless such consequences are abiding, a great part of our Lord's teaching is eviscerated and pointless. Further, this teaching of His is anything but limited to the last period, at which certain critics would have us regard Him as in some sense 'carried away' by apocalyptic. It runs all through His ministry. It is embedded in the fibre and texture of His preaching.

Second, the very essence of the notion of Hell is its endlessness. Conceptions of the details of existence in Hell are very unimportant. But as a place or state of exclusion from satisfaction, whatever be the nature or the degree of the dissatisfaction felt, what makes it Hell is nothing but its unendingness. Without that it is not Hell at all.

The Ninth Conference of Modern Churchmen was held in August this year at Somerville College, Oxford, and it had for its theme 'Christianity as the World Religion.' The papers read at the Conference are published in the October number of *The Modern Churchman*, and they are worth publishing. But none is more worthy of its place than the brief essay by Professor W. R. Matthews of King's College, London.

His subject was 'The Finality of Christianity,' and his treatment of it was not only able but in every sense satisfying and reassuring. We use the word 'reassuring,' because the suspicion has been widely entertained that the members of 'the Churchmen's union' are, not only 'liberal,' but uncertain on the vital question raised in this very paper. After all, the one thing that matters is whether Christianity is the absolute religion. 'Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?' Is Christ the Final Word, God's ultimatum?

There is no uncertainty in Dr. Matthews' answer. He goes to the heart of the matter at once by discussing the suggestion that evolution negatives the claim of finality for Christ. He admits that we can never reach an absolute so long as our standpoint is purely evolutionary. But he denies that the evolutionary method can give us a final explanation of any reality. 'When we are dealing with spiritual activity . . . the thoroughgoing evolutionist is helpless or a prey to the most ludicrous illusions.'

This is evident if we look only at literature. We do not explain Shakespeare by any number of influences. The reality of Shakespeare lies in his insight into human nature and his interpretation of life. In these respects he stands by himself. The evolution of literature goes on but it does not transcend him. His insight and experience remain, in a sense, final.

The same is true of philosophy. Lord Haldane said in his Gifford Lectures that philosophy at the present day has not advanced beyond Aristotle.

But indeed every philosopher would make for himself the claim that Lord Haldane makes for Aristotle. He would in a real sense claim for his particular vision finality. But Aristotle will suffice. He stands out, a unique human fact not at the end of the human process but in the midst of it. The evolutionary standpoint does not explain Aristotle.

In the light of such facts we can say that there is no inherent improbability in the occurrence of an absolute and normative religious experience in an historical person. That is enough as a background for the claim of Christianity. Dr. MATTHEWS goes on to consider the possibility in the light of more definitely theistic assumptions, and especially the assumption that a personal over-ruling God would reveal Himself to man through persons and in history. To suppose that this revelation would be wholly progressive, so as not to reach finality at any point, would involve the absurdity of believing that the revelation would be complete only when there were no human minds left to receive it.

But the argument is not complete. The final step is taken when we see that Christianity is the culmination and completion of ethical monotheism, which is the true line of religious evolution. The highest form of religion must be some form of ethical monotheism, because this not only enables the mind to think of the universe as one, but satisfies the ideal of righteousness and finds in the unseen the ground and sanction of moral values. It needs no argument to show that Christianity satisfies this test. It is not only the culmination but the consummation of ethical monotheism. There can be no advance in this religious achievement which would lead us away from the Christian affirmations, for the simple reason that nothing higher can be conceived than that Holy Love which the Incarnation reveals.

The task of the future, then, is not to transcend Christianity, but to understand it and to interpret it. 'I am very sure that we have much to learn from other faiths and from philosophy and science. But when all is learnt and said we may be confident that it will be clearer than ever that it is in the Gospel that He has spoken to us through His Son.'

'Anybody might say, "Very few men are really manly." Nobody would say, "Very few whales are really whaley." If you wanted to dissuade a man from drinking his tenth whisky, you would slap him on the back and say, "Be a man." No one who wished to dissuade a crocodile from eating his tenth explorer would slap it on the back and say, "Be a crocodile." For we have no notion of a perfect crocodile, no allegory of a whale expelled from his whaley Eden.'

These words of Mr. G. K. Chesterton are aptly quoted by Hubert L. SIMPSON in *Altars of Earth* (when discussing the vexed question of the Fall). They imply that there is an ideal of manhood below which man has fallen, and a standard above him to which by common consent he ought to conform.

Does Evolution contradict Genesis? Must we cease to speak of the Fall, and proclaim only the Ascent of Man. Evolutionists said so in the first flush of triumphant acceptance of the new theory, and weak-kneed preachers have been known to speak of a 'Fall upwards.' But this position is now seen to be untenable. Logically it implies that man is all that he might have been. He has not failed to achieve his destiny, and this is the best possible world, or if it be not, the fault at any rate does not lie with man. History refuses to assent to such a doctrine, and the present world-chaos has shattered belief in the unbroken Ascent of Man.

The truth is that there has been both a fall and a rise. An intellectual rise may accompany a spiritual fall. The knowledge of good and evil may come by an act of moral disobedience, and human history be a record of learning and sinning. 'The man who flies at a hundred miles an hour in

an aeroplane has demonstrated the ascent of man in intellectual capacity, but when he comes down and indulges too freely in a champagne dinner he has equally strikingly demonstrated the fall from grace in which Adam spoke with the Lord God in the garden in the cool of the evening.'

So the moral history of the race is still a tragedy, darkly shadowed with all the pathos of what might have been. As J. H. Bernard says (*H.D.B.* i. 844): 'Had primeval man been strong when evil presented itself, we know not to what heights of intellectual, as of spiritual excellence, the race might not have attained.'

Amos 5^{25} presents a problem. It seems to shut us up to a dilemma, and on neither horn can we sit with any comfort. Amos seems to be going astray either in his history or in his doctrine. 'Did ye bring me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' What does that mean? Are we to infer that in the view of Amos the wilderness period was a golden age of purely spiritual worship, when the whole machinery of priest and smoking altar was not devised? If so, he is clearly wrong. The spiritual condition of Israel wandering like Bedawin cannot conceivably have been a high-water mark. Still more incredible would it be that, while all their contemporaries practised sacrifice, Israel had none of it.

Does it mean, did ye bring me *only* sacrifice, did not your spirit correspond to the outward acts of devotion? One may say so, but one will have difficulty in proving that anything like that is in the mind of Amos. Does the whole passage mean that Amos would abolish all external forms of worship, and attach no value to anything except a true life, personal and social righteousness? If so, he is wrong there too. For, says Dr. W. E. Orchard, in *The Oracles of God* (Clarke & Co.; 6s.), 'it is a proposal that will not work. It is a proposal which, carried to its logical conclusion, would dispense not only with every symbolical, but any verbal expression of the worship of God; there would soon be nothing to remind us of our social duties; a wholly immanent religion would soon cease to be a religion at all, but become a pure ethic, and in time not much of an ethic at that. . . . History has tried this way too, and a remedy it certainly is not.'

Dr. Orchard's view is that Amos's fiery indignation has carried him too far, and we must just correct him by the other prophets. Yet we must pay heed to his indignant protest as 'we must listen to the same condemnation to-day, when men coming straight from simpler life and confronted with the ignorance, the misery, the luxury, and the vice of our time, ask in anger what the churches are doing beside their elaborate services and their perpetual hymn-singing.' 'If it is an exaggeration we must honour the indignation that creates it.'

Dr. James Hastings.

THE EDITOR.

By the Right Reverend Bishop Herbert E. Ryle, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

I should be grateful, if I might be allowed to pay a brief but most sincere and affectionate tribute to the life-work of the late Dr. James Hastings. Few men have rendered such important service to the cause of Biblical studies. His name should be held in high honour by those who come after us.

It was my privilege first to meet him in connexion with The Expository Times, which he started in 1889. He had quite rightly discovered that there was an opening for a journal which would help to popularize the results of scholarly study, and to render accessible to thoughtful and intelligent readers the materials which are liable to be hidden away in learned periodicals. Reviews of books, articles by able and leading men, homiletic outlines, correspondence upon matters of exegetical interest, helped to render the magazine highly successful, eminently readable, and genuinely useful up to the present day.

I have always supposed that his experience in the early days of The Expository Times had two important results. In the first place, it revealed, either to him or to his publishers, that he possessed first-rate gifts as an Editor; and, in the second place, it convinced him that there was a pressing need in Great Britain for a Biblical Dictionary that could supply the needs of students and scholars, and remove the reproach of the necessity of continual reference to foreign authorities.

The famous Dictionary of the Bible (4 vols., 1898–1902; extra volume, 1904) was the monumental work by which he became generally known, and for which he has earned the gratitude of the reading world. He carried out his great scheme with characteristic enthusiasm, patience, tact, and firmness.

The book at once commended itself to students for the reverent tone as well as for the standard of trustworthy scholarship, the well-selected range of subject, and the thoroughness of treatment upon which the Editor insisted.

His subsequent Dictionaries, the one-volume Dictionary of the Bible (1908), the Dictionaries of Christ and the Gospels and The Apostolic Church, were also all of them most helpful to Biblical students. He most skilfully and successfully secured a great collection of careful and able articles from first-rate scholars.

It is, however, not too much to say that the gigantic undertaking of editing the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics in twelve volumes (1908–1922) was in some respects the most remarkable achievement by this prince of editors. He obtained as contributors specialists on almost every subject. Writers of very numerous nationalities were glad to co-operate in the production of this colossal work. It has quickly become a standard book of reference: and some of the most eminent scholars of the day having contributed articles, *e.g.*, upon comparative religion, ethics, and religious philosophy, the Encyclopædia is bound to possess permanent value.

Others, however, who will have been in closer personal touch with him in his splendid work, will be better able than I to speak of what Dr. Hastings accomplished, and of how he accomplished it.

I only wish to put on record my feeling of intense gratitude to him for the magnificent service which his editorial work has been the means of rendering to the knowledge and study of Holy Scripture.

He was, as I have called him, a prince of editors. But he was a great deal more than that: he was a devoted servant of Christ, and a man inspired with an unquenchable love of the Word of God.

THE MAN.

By Professor W. A. Curtis, D.D., D.Litt., The University, Edinburgh.

It is with a fresh pang of sorrowful regret that I take up my pen and write the title of this simple tribute. The passing of Dr. Hastings from his earthly work to his rest and his reward is an event that touches profoundly every heart in Scotland, and a great company far beyond, to whom the cause of religious learning and the advancement of Biblical studies is sacred. Not yet can we measure the meaning of his withdrawal from that editorial chair in Aberdeen from which for so many years an unending stream of theological commissions and directions has flowed to the very ends of the

earth. Measured by any standard of accomplishment, he has achieved a work of theological education without parallel in the history of our race and language. In that far-spreading influence he has his true monument among us, a cairn of remembrance whose sheer mass and solid grandeur needs no eulogistic inscription from any literary graver's hand. By his individual courage and toil, by his penetrating insight into the deeper needs of the religious world for competent guidance in its use of its authoritative Scriptures, by his singular combination of the zeal of a visionary with the common sense and shrewd judgment of a business man, by his persistence in tracking down the men he needed for the myriad tasks which were essential to his herculean enterprise, and in persuading them to lay other work aside and assist him in completing it, it is not too much to say that he effected a revolution in the theological world, and gave to Scotland a new place and rank in the records of religious study and research.

To write his name is enough to call him up before me. I need no photograph, no letter, no echo of his voice, to enable me to picture him and to listen to his tones. That spare, erect, well-groomed figure; that fresh-complexioned, clear-cut, candid, slightly nervous face, modest, kind, alert, half-anxious, half-serene; that eager yet judicial voice, made up a presence never to be forgotten. After he came to Aberdeen my postal acquaintance with him deepened into warm friendship, and a certain unleisured intimacy. To be admitted to the house he thenceforward made his home was to discover that house and home became him as perfectly as his dress. Refinement, order, dignity, surrounded him. His library became proverbial for its resources, but it preserved an incredible neatness and disconcerted the eye that looked for a pardonable disarray. Its omnipresent shelving housed not only workaday volumes in their publishers' cloth-bindings, but an aristocracy of favourites in general literature clad in sumptuous apparel of calf and morocco and parchment. It abounded in matter—matter so ample as to suffice for well-nigh every requirement of the most assiduous and exacting proof-reading, as careless writers soon discovered to their chagrin—but it was matter emphatically in the right place. It was eloquent of the order without which a library may easily master its owner. It was his servant, instantly at command, comely, cheerful, tidy, with a sort of cap-and-apron solicitude about it at all times, very ready and willing to be of use.

And the Master himself! I shall always think of him as, both literally and figuratively, a scholar without a stoop. A puritan in his moral austerity, he disclosed a mind of transparent wholesomeness. His passion for cleanliness was own-sister to his passion for accuracy. Catholic as he was in his reading, counting very little in literature as wholly alien to him, it was wonderful to observe the undulled edge of his ethical and spiritual sensitiveness. He never lost his sense of the value of black and white in his appreciation of the varied colours of modern life and thought. Every inch a scholar, a true believer in the value and power of scholarship, finding infinite contentment and happiness in the promotion of scholarship, he was, notwithstanding, incapable of sinking his personality in scholarly preoccupation. He cherished a burning interest in public life, in social questions, and, above all, in the mission of the Church to evangelize humanity and to advance the Kingdom of God on earth. In the study as well as in the pulpit a simple fervour would possess him as he responded to the call of these high interests. If *fiat lux* might have been his motto in life, he could radiate warmth as well as light. I believe the deepest motive of his lifelong enterprise as an Editor was the desire to furnish the Church and the Ministry of the coming years, not merely with the information which their widening intelligence demands, but with the spiritual material for an enduring conviction which shall overflow in a message of persuasive power to mankind. In his great series of Dictionaries and in the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics he might suppress himself to outward seeming, contenting himself in the main with an organizer's function, selecting his workers, co-ordinating their output, and maintaining their standard, but in The Expository Times and in his homiletic books he was free to reveal his bent. No toil that would serve in any degree to improve the equipment of the Christian ministry for its pulpit service would he grudge. Month after month he set before his readers with unfailing resourcefulness fresh illustrations of the homiletic material available for use in the preacher's preparation. No one knew better than he the danger besetting all such publications, the thinness of the line between labour-saving and idleness-promoting. I think he would have urged that since nobody

questioned the timeliness of his service to the scholar's equipment through his dictionary work, nobody need grudge to the preacher a corresponding service. Not every study is a Newcastle requiring no fuel import. He intended that the aids he offered to the pulpit should be used as incentives and examples, stimulating personal thought and similar research.

One winces as one regards that vacant chair. Who is to take its owner's place? Of scholarship our country has no lack, but of editorial courage it cannot boast. Not a single commanding weekly journal of religion, theology, and Church life does Scotland possess, or has it ever possessed. *The Critical Review* is gone, without successor. One hopes that THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will continue to flourish and save at least a fragment of our face. Our country has no greater need, I believe, than a strong, well-edited, and comprehensive Religious Weekly, and a similar Monthly. Not till another James Hastings appears shall we obtain them, and remove our national reproach. Where is the man?

What do we not owe to him for the encouragement he has given to generation after generation of our younger scholars in all the Churches to make their first essays in constructive literary work? Our first and our supreme organizer of post-graduate research in Theology, he cherished a Baconian vision of co-operative scholarship, and while others were content to dream he set the printing-press in motion. If, as I believe, it is true that our Scottish ministry and Churches now occupy a unique position in the Christian world as combining an open mind with a tenacious loyalty to the religious past, and that the successors to Robertson Smith and his fellow-pioneers in Biblical studies have been unembarrassed by the clamour of ecclesiastical and popular suspicion and misgiving, we owe it very largely to him. His editorial instinct to choose for his undertakings men in all lands whose reverence and patience in the search for scientific truth were a security alike against obscurantism and against reckless innovation amounted to a kind of divination. Research moves on, and dictionaries and cyclopædias inevitably age, but his great works hold their own to-day as still essentially adequate to their purpose. They amply vindicate his method, his aim, and his critical principles. He was indeed happy to have been permitted to carry them to completion.

The recollection of personal incidents which threw a vivid light upon his Christian temper, his generous heart, his chivalrous judgment, is fresh within my mind. I must content myself with one. A prominent review by him in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of a striking book by a talented but little-known writer impressed me at the time as unwontedly harsh and as inappreciative of its mystical insight and frequent literary beauty. I wrote to him a friendly remonstrance, and told him what I knew of the writer and his mind and gifts. His reply was immediate and full of generous concern. He begged me to take as many columns of the next issue as I cared and do justice to the book—a kindness of which I, as promptly, availed myself with gratitude. Editors of that order are hardly numerous. It was not less characteristic of him that he had resented two features of the book, a certain looseness of structure and a dangerous sympathy with pantheistic forms of thought and expression.

To the memory of such a life and character, one is proud to do reverence. Scholar, thinker, preacher, friend, and man, we miss him sadly, but we think of him with deep and enduring thankfulness.

THE LIFE-WORK.

By PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.PHIL., D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

A MAN who planned and finished so great a life-work as Dr. James Hastings cannot be summed up in any phrase. Nor is analysis of one we regard with loving admiration either a pleasing or a hopeful and promising pursuit. I will therefore make no attempt in these lines to separate out the elements of character and intellect which made him what he was, still less to compare him with others belonging to his own high class. It will suffice to convey some personal impressions left, during twenty-five years, on the mind of one who could not hear his name uttered without an involuntary movement of gratitude.

Naturally we think first of his absorbing interest in the Bible. To glance down the list of works for which he became responsible is to realize vividly that the modern Bible-reader probably owes more to Dr. Hastings than to any other one scholar of our generation. To some people the Bible is a warehouse of texts; to others a literature on which as critics they may impose their own dictatorial

formulæ; to him it was the recorded converse of God with man. He would have claimed, with Coleridge, to read the Bible as he did any other book, 'so far as I can or dare.' But the book must be read with the understanding no less than the spirit; and one principle which controlled all Dr. Hastings' work was this, that the truth about anything in the Bible, scientifically ascertained, was more interesting by far, as well as more edifying, than the most venerable but inaccurate opinions. Hence in magazine and dictionary he set himself, first and last, to bring out the sense of Scripture.

On that subject he offered to the world the best information which modern scholarship can furnish. He offered it in a shape that was in a remarkable degree full, accessible, and trustworthy. Round him a large and ever-growing band of scholars assembled. On the title-page of the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, vol. i., his named assistants, in addition to Dr. Selbie, are Dr. A. B. Davidson, Dr. Driver, and Dr. Swete. In the background, with unceasing aid and encouragement, is Dr. Sanday. People felt from the start that such an enterprise was of no little religious importance, and that from the intellectual point of view nothing could be more wholesome or stimulating. They have had no reason to change their views. The succeeding Dictionaries, up to and including the great Encyclopædia, revealed a steady application of the same principles, the same maxims of truth-loving scholarship and spiritual common-sense and single-minded Christian faith; with, of course, the ever-growing refinement of accuracy, due to the progress of theological science, in the application of these p inciples to problems old and new.

In Dr. Hastings' mind all this was for a purpose. His supreme aim was to foster exposition of the Bible, in church and class-room. Here is the significant paragraph which opens the Preface to his first Dictionary:

> 'Give heed to . . . teaching. Perhaps the Church of Christ has never given sufficient heed to teaching since the earliest and happiest days. In our own day the importance of teaching, or, as we sometimes call it, expository preaching, has been pressed home through causes that are various yet never accidental; and it is probable that in the near future more heed will be given by the Church to teaching than has ever been given before.
>
> 'As a contribution towards the furnishing of the Church for that great work, this DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE is published.'

There, in a style all his own, he betrays the one great interest of his life. He wrought to better the outfit of the expositor.

In this character, he united in a singular way two qualities often found in antagonism—extremely positive evangelical conviction and a passionate attachment (it was nothing less) to Biblical criticism. Few men have seen more clearly that these two, far from enemies, are allied by essential nature. I dare say he received many anonymous letters denouncing him for this, but the position for him was an axiom. Like Robertson Smith, he found no difficulty in loving the Gospel while at the same time he toiled unendingly to mediate knowledge of the processes and events through which this Gospel had taken shape in history. Now and then the old question comes up whether we can consistently both believe and criticise; for many, the most convincing answer to that inquiry will always be an actual instance like Dr. Hastings, in whom the two devotions were combined not only without hesitancy, but with perfect naturalness.

Others with more technical insight must speak of his genius as Editor. The word 'genius' is surely not overstrained; speaking for myself, I can only say that after early doubts as to the wisdom of certain enterprises he had planned, I came to the conclusion that he saw far more deeply than any one else into the legitimate wants of his great constituency, and knew better how worthily to satisfy them. We cannot be too deeply thankful that he lived to see his *magnum opus* (except for the Index) complete in twelve volumes. It will carry his name down for generations. The most important German rival is really not in the same class. Its generous tribute to the Encyclopædia is to say that 'in it the Anglo-Saxons, who up till now have so much leaned on German theology, have emancipated themselves; not only so, they have surpassed us in wealth of material and the fulness of individual contribution.'[1] Much the greater part of his literary output, so far as I know, was editorial, and none the less original on that account. Including thirty-three yearly issues of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, at least eighty-seven volumes came from his hand. In

[1] *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Bd. iv. col. 649.

the list of twentieth-century bookmen his name will be placed high.

The theology of Great Britain has been called provincial, though in point of fact it is noticeably less so than that of, say, Germany. And no one did more to keep the outlook wide and hospitable than he whom we have now lost. From the beginning he recognized that there are no frontiers for ideas. British reviews in which the products of Continental theological thought and scholarship are noted and estimated might be counted on the fingers of one hand, and among these THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has always taken a leading place. So, too, in his great company of contributors to the *E.R.E.* (to use the pregnant initials), the names of German, American, French, and Dutch scholars occur familiarly. Their articles came in before the war and after the war. The massive article on the Religion of Israel, for example, contained in the extra volume of the first Dictionary, and one of the most important treatises Kautzsch of Halle ever wrote, was done at Dr. Hastings' request. The same genuine width of mind led him to give many younger writers here their first chance. Faithful as he was to old friends, he acted as if he believed that a man's most original work, in the majority of cases, has been done by the time he is forty. Thus he 'fanned intelligence' in the churches of our land.

Space fails, and I cannot touch on his excellence as a preacher, or the affectionate assiduity of his pastoral care. To many among the thousands of his readers it must have come as a surprise to learn that much the longer portion of his working life was spent in the regular ministry. But it is impossible to end without the plain unvarnished statement that he was a very good man. He was good, in the sense which the Bible gives to that noble word. Transparent and unselfish courtesy, beneficent firmness in the right, fidelity, all suffused with the fear and love of God—these marked him, these linger now in memory. He rejoiced in the triumphs of Christ. He would have gone to the stake for the Gospel of the Cross. We are rightly told that, under God, no man is indispensable; but this does not at all mean that he can be replaced. And it may be long before another Hastings, with the same gifts, and the same consecrated zest, comes to enrich the Christian society, and to earn gratitude from all to whom light on the faiths of men is a coveted gain.

The First and Second Epistles to the Philippians.

By Professor the Reverend J. Hugh Michael, M.A., Victoria College, Toronto, Canada.

By most English writers on *Philippians* it is either tacitly assumed, or else maintained after a more or less summary dismissal of the opposing view, that the extant Epistle is the first letter addressed by Paul to Philippi after he had received the gift brought by the hand of Epaphroditus, and accordingly that the great passage in the fourth chapter in which he speaks of the gift (4^{10-20}) is his first expression of thanks for the generosity of the Philippians. That Paul had received a letter from Philippi *after* the coming of the gift is, in view of 2^{26}, regarded by some as possible, by others as probable, but, so far as I am aware, Allen and Grensted are alone among English writers in thinking that Paul had already written to thank the Philippians, thereby eliciting a second letter from Philippi, to which in turn reply is made in the extant Epistle.

This reading of the situation, as every student of the New Testament knows, is set forth with great fulness by Zahn, who bases his view mainly upon the indications furnished by our Epistle that no inconsiderable time had elapsed between the coming of the gift and the writing of *Philippians*, during which period, as we know, news had been interchanged between Rome and Philippi. Epaphroditus, as we learn, had fallen sick in Rome, and news of his illness had reached Philippi. Tidings of the consequent distress of the Philippians had in turn reached Epaphroditus at Rome. 'With these interchanges,' says Zahn, 'which took place between the arrival and departure of Epaphroditus, it is self-evident that other news also was interchanged between Philippi and Rome and Rome and Philippi. As the messengers came and went, they would naturally be entrusted with letters.' A moment's reflection will show how reasonable is this conclusion. Paul had received a gift from the

Philippians. Soon after there travelled from Rome to Philippi some one who was sufficiently interested both in Epaphroditus and in the Philippian Christians to bear to the latter the news of the illness of the former: it is scarcely conceivable that Paul would fail to avail himself of the opportunity to send his thanks to his generous friends at Philippi. By and by there comes from Philippi to Rome some one sufficiently interested in the Christians at Philippi and in their representative at Rome to convey to him tidings of the anxiety created at Philippi by the news of his sickness, and it is difficult to think that the Philippians would allow the opportunity to slip without writing to Paul and to Epaphroditus.

Zahn finds corroboration of his theory at many points in the Epistle; he makes, however, singularly little use of 4^{10-20}, an omission which is strange, for, as it seems to me, it can be shown well-nigh, if not quite, to the point of demonstration on the basis of that paragraph alone that Paul had replied to the letter that came with the gift, that the Philippians, piqued at what seemed to them to be a lack of adequate appreciation on his part, had written again, giving vent to their feeling of resentment, and that it is this second letter that is answered in our *Philippians*. It is the main purpose of this paper, without going beyond the bounds of the paragraph, to extract this evidence, and thereby to supplement the evidence furnished by Zahn. This does not mean, however, that we accept Zahn's view of the situation in all its details.

It is significant, in the first place, that the paragraph comes at the very end of the Epistle. There may be passing references to the gift of the Philippians earlier in the letter, as, for example, in 1^{5} and 2^{30}, but Paul 'has not, up till now, expressly thanked them for their generous gift.' Even if it be granted, as doubtless it should be, that the order of topics in Paul's Epistles is often determined by the order of the letter to which he is replying, it is in the highest degree unlikely that, having received from the Philippians a gift and a letter he should make no express mention of the gift until the concluding paragraph of his reply.

Suggestive also is the fact that the paragraph contains no *direct* expression of thanks. This lends some support to the view that we have in our Epistle not the first declaration of the Apostle's gratitude, but rather a supplementary statement.

Paul's extraordinary emphasis on his independence points in the same direction. So pronounced an assertion would be neither natural nor seemly as part of an expression of gratitude for a gift. A passing allusion to his independence might conceivably have formed part of an original declaration of thanks, but it is not easy to account for so full and emphatic a pronouncement on any other ground than that it is an expansion in self-defence of some previous remark which had been misconstrued by his correspondents. Paul's vehemence is sometimes explained on the ground that he has in mind the slanderous charges brought against him by those who asserted that his preaching of the Gospel was only a means of livelihood. That such charges were made we know from other Epistles. But is it in the least degree probable that it would have been necessary for him to clear himself of charges of that nature when writing to the Philippians, who not long before had sent him a gift of money? They surely needed no assurance of his disinterestedness.

Rightly understood, v.[15] leads us to the same conclusion. There Paul addresses his readers by a general appellation—'Philippians.' In two other places in his Epistles he thus addresses his readers, namely, in Gal 3^{1} and 2 Co 6^{11}. Some detect only the tone of anger in the Galatian apostrophe, but Ramsay is surely justified in speaking of pathos as its most prominent note. The most natural explanation of such an appellation as we see in these three passages, as it seems to me, is the desire on the part of the writer to soften and tone down the severity of a reproof. This motive is perfectly evident in the Galatian and Corinthian passages, for in both cases it is easy to see that Paul is rebuking his readers. Is the same motive at work in Ph 4^{15}? Is it possible to detect the note of censure in this verse, so replete, it would seem, with tender and grateful reminiscence on the part of Paul? It is by no means impossible that Paul is censuring his readers here, for we may give to the opening words of the verse—'and ye yourselves also know' (οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς)—a meaning which alters its whole complexion. Years ago Dr. Rendel Harris pointed out that in several of its occurrences in 1 Thessalonians the word οἴδατε ('ye know') 'must be understood in the sense "ye have admitted in your letter," or, "ye have testified."' Does not the emphatic pronoun, as well as the 'also,' in the verse we are

discussing suggest that the verb should be given some such meaning here? Paul, forsooth, is not alone in remembering the past kindnesses of the Philippians. A letter from Philippi has given him to understand that there also they are remembered. Writers on *Philippians* often speak of the graciousness that prompted Paul to refer to the past acts of generosity; but as a matter of fact it was the Philippians themselves who first made mention of them, and apparently Paul was not altogether pleased; he would have endorsed the sentiment of Cicero, who says of benefits conferred: *meminisse debet is in quem collata sunt, non commemorare qui contulit.* Paul resents the implication that he needed the reminder. His very mention in our letter of the unnecessary reminder is a rebuke, but the insertion of the appellation 'Philippians' shows that he is anxious to tinge it with tenderness lest it might seem too severe. Now how came the Philippians to remind the Apostle of their generosity in past days? Of one thing we may be certain: the reminder was not part of the letter that came with the gift. It only becomes intelligible on the supposition that in his original acknowledgment Paul had said something that brought disappointment to those from whom the gift had come, and aroused their displeasure. If our interpretation is correct, v.[15] alone is sufficient to establish the view that Paul had already acknowledged the gift and had received a subsequent letter from Philippi before he penned the extant Epistle.

Our paragraph contains one or two further indications that the Apostle is gently rebuking the Philippians, and every sign of reproof adds support to our reading of the situation. Even in v.[15], which, as we have seen, chides them for their unnecessary reminder of their past generosity, he deftly contrives to convey the hint that the gifts of which they would put him in mind were after all but the payment of a debt. They alone of all the churches, we read, had had fellowship with him 'in the matter of giving and receiving' (εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως). The phrase belongs to the language of commerce, and refers to the credit and debit side of an account. It is out of harmony with the usual significance of the expression to limit its reference, as Grotius and Lightfoot do, to the monetary gifts. According to their interpretation of the phrase the 'giving' refers solely to the bestowal of the gifts by the Philippians, and the 'receiving' solely to their acceptance by Paul, but unless we give to the words their common meaning, there is no reason why the phrase should be applicable to the Church at Philippi alone; it could be used equally well of all the Pauline Churches,—though not, of course, with reference to monetary gifts—for in the case of each and all of them there was a giving and a receiving—a giving of spiritual gifts on the part of Paul and a receiving of them by the members. What put the Philippian Church in a class by itself was that in its case there was a double transaction—a passing of the things of the spirit in one direction and of monetary help in another. We may be sure that the use of the phrase by Paul is a gentle hint that the material gifts of the Philippians had been matched and more than matched by the spiritual gifts conferred upon them through his instrumentality; and we may be equally sure that the hint was not lost upon the readers. Paul says in effect to them what he says to the Corinthians: 'If we sowed unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things?' (1 Co 9[11]).

With the same delicacy of touch the hint is again conveyed a little later in our paragraph. 'Your debt to me is fully paid' is Dr. Moffatt's translation of ἀπέχω πάντα in v.[18], and at this time of day the rendering requires no apology. It is Paul's pleasant way of saying that there is in his soul no taint of dissatisfaction with the gift from Philippi, but surely the hint is unmistakable that it is but the payment of a debt.

Let us now ask whether it is possible by reading between the lines of the paragraph we are studying to discover any hints of what was said regarding the gift in the earlier letters. An arresting feature of the paragraph is the violent alternation it exhibits between Paul's appreciation of the kindness of the Philippians on the one hand, and his insistence on his own independence on the other. The kindness of the Philippians is the subject of vv.[10. 14-16 18-20], whereas his independence is the subject of the intervening verses, namely, vv.[11-13. 17], and it is worthy of note that two of these sub-sections are introduced by 'not that' (οὐχ ὅτι), and a third by 'howbeit' (πλήν). These introductory particles show that Paul is feverishly endeavouring to strike the balance between his gratitude and his independence, to escape on the one side the Scylla of seeming to lose his independence when he is appreciative,

and on the other the Charybdis of seeming to be lacking in appreciation when he declares his independence; and it is hard to think that he would write just in the way he does unless he were conscious of some constraint. One can scarcely imagine a writer free to acknowledge a gift in his own way adopting such a method. Paul appears to be attempting to reconcile two positions which he does not find over-easy to reconcile. He is driving a pair of horses which are somewhat intractable. The whole paragraph is difficult to explain except as a defence and expansion of positions previously assumed. Should we not be justified in inferring that in his former letter to the Philippians the Apostle had informed them that he appreciated their kindness but that he really was not in need of the gift? That the Philippians should take umbrage at the second statement is intelligible, for it might well seem to them to discount the value of the former. It may be that Paul's first letter was hurriedly written, or perhaps the composing of it was left to an amanuensis, who may not have expressed the Apostle's sentiments with the care and delicacy with which he himself would have expressed them. In any case the proud Macedonians appear to have taken offence and to have written reminding Paul of the time when he *did* need their help. The suggestion that he needed the reminder was not pleasing to the Apostle, but he would not go back on what he had said. That is why in our paragraph he endeavours with so much earnestness to reconcile appreciation with an insistence upon his independence. Apart from some such background as we have sketched it is not easy to account for the vehement alternation.

Can we take a further step? Is it possible to suggest any reason why Paul should have told the Philippians that he was not in need of the gift? He opens the paragraph we are studying with the statement that he rejoiced greatly in the Lord that 'now at length' (ἤδη ποτέ) they had revived their thought for him (v.[10]). Attempts have been made to render these words in such a way as to avoid the reproach which they naturally seem to involve; but even if it be possible so to render them, it must be admitted that the expression ἤδη ποτέ was at least liable to be taken as involving a rebuke. It may be true, as we have tried to argue, that Paul is reproaching his correspondents in this paragraph, but he administers his rebuke with a delicacy which forbids us to think that he would choose a phrase in which they might read a sarcastic taunt at their delay, qualified though the words are by the immediately succeeding sentence. The only rational explanation of the use of the phrase ἤδη ποτέ by Paul is that he is quoting words first used by the Philippians themselves. It was they who had first spoken of the gift as being dispatched 'now at length,' and it is much more probable that they would so speak in their first letter than in their second; for, in the first place, the phrase seems unnatural unless it occurred in the letter that accompanied the gift; and, in the second place, it is not likely that the Philippians would have tendered an apology for the delay after they had been offended by Paul's first reply.

If this surmise is true, that in the letter sent with the gift the Philippians used the words 'now at length,' apologizing for their tardiness, a natural desire to assuage their regret may well have prompted Paul to assure them that he was not in actual need of the help they had sent. Apparently a statement made with kindly intent was regarded by the Philippians as evidence of ingratitude, provoking the resentful reply to which Paul makes answer in our Epistle. Hoping to mitigate their remorse, the Apostle succeeded only in evoking a recital of the occasions on which he had been glad to receive their help. The noble passage which forms the subject of our study is Paul's reply.

Our interpretation of the passage brings into relief certain traits in Paul's character, none more clearly than a certain pertinaciousness, amounting almost to stubbornness, a quality which must have done much to sustain him in his labours and trials; for, as we have seen, he refuses to stir from the position he had taken up in his earlier letter. He explains and expands, but he will not withdraw! Some writers see not a little pleasantry in the use made throughout the passage of financial terms and phrases. There may be a slight touch of playfulness here and there, but the tone of the passage is too serious to admit of much pleasantry, for there quivers through it a nervous anxiety to banish misunderstanding from the minds of his beloved Philippians. Out of this anxiety arises the doxology with which the passage closes. Paul lifts his readers into the very presence of God, for he knows that there, as nowhere else, misunderstandings wither and die.

Literature.

OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS.

There is no more intriguing figure in the contemporary religious world than that of the 'gloomy Dean.' The adjective has been attached to him probably from the acid quality of the criticism he has directed upon many current notions and institutions. But it cannot fairly be said that the description is accurate. One might say that the boot is on the other leg; in other words, that the gloom exists in the minds of those who have felt the sting of his shafts. Dean Inge is no pessimist. No one with his robust faith could be a pessimist. But he has an eye for reality, and an intolerance of shams, *e.g.*, of mere tradition that persists in spite of facts. He has much to say about the Church which is humbling and disillusionizing, but he has no doubt whatever about the permanence of the Church itself. It is as inevitable as the sunshine.

What impresses a reader of his new volume of Essays—*Outspoken Essays*, second series (Longmans; 6s. net)—is their sheer ability. They include his Romanes Lecture on 'The Idea of Progress,' which was widely discussed on its first appearance, his Rede Lecture on 'The Victorian Age,' the series of five Hibbert Lectures on 'The State, Visible and Invisible,' and a drastic treatment of 'Eugenics.' All the essays exhibit the same quality, a certain intellectual mastery, a close and searching power of thought, as well as (of course) an independence that takes nothing for granted.

The most interesting of all the chapters is the first, which occupies sixty pages, and is headed 'Confessio Fidei.' To hear from so sincere a thinker what he really believes is an uncommon blessing, and it is doubled when one remembers that nothing will be set down that is not thoroughly tested. There is not a page of this remarkable essay that is not thought-provoking, and there is a great deal of it that is reassuring to less daring minds. The general standpoint may be described as that of a Christian Platonism. Faith is really a sense of the eternal values. To believe in Truth, Beauty, and Goodness is to have a part in the life of God. And religious experience verifies the absoluteness of these values. It is difficult to summarize the meditation in which this position is vindicated. All that need be said is that the spiritual attitude to the world and truth is convincingly defended. It would be difficult to find a more persuasive exposure of the inadequacy and untruth of naturalism than these pages furnish. But while the main strength of the argument is spent on this general thesis, the Dean finally arrives at the question of historic Christianity. On the main points, the Incarnation and the Cross, he is quite positive, if not entirely orthodox. What he says of the miraculous element is not perhaps what we should wish. It is difficult to maintain so detached an attitude of mind on the question as we find here, unless indeed you are a mystic and a Platonist. But there is light by the way on many vexed problems like suffering and evil, and those who seek for guidance on the great questions of faith will find much to help them in this frank, able, and fearless self-disclosure.

THE STORY OF MANKIND.

We all want to know all about everything. It may be a weakness, but it is an amiable one. The publishers of encyclopædias flourish on it, and that is well. So do the writers of Histories of the World, like H. G. Wells and Hendrik van Loon.

Hendrik van Loon has written *The Story of Mankind* (Harrap; 12s. 6d. net). And he has illustrated it. And the illustrations are quite as startling as the writing. You open the book, and find a picture consisting of an arch of a bridge—such a bridge as would shame a dry-stone dyke mason—five soldiers or some such figures marching one way over it, and five soldiers marching the other, the bridge being coloured a dingy yellow, and the water beneath a faded blue; and 'Rome' is printed in capital letters below. It is all meant to be realistic. But surely the bridge should have been blue and the river yellow, for the Tiber is now and ever has been the yellowest river in Europe.

But you need not be offended, for the book is not for you. It is for your children. And the pictures will convey some impression to them, even if it be occasionally an erroneous one. Still, we prefer the writing. It is not childish nor is it childlike. We are not sure that any child will take to it in preference to *The Pilgrim's Progress* or *Robinson Crusoe*. But it is at least fresh. If the child when discovered has been fed with the school histories,

and is fed up with them, he will enjoy this history, just as he enjoys the chocolates, if they are passed to him, when the daily dinner is over.

After the history come the reflexions. We quote a paragraph: 'The greatest glory of England does not lie in her vast colonial possessions, in her wealth or her navy, but in the quiet heroism and independence of her average citizen. The Englishman obeys the law, because he knows that respect for the rights of others marks the difference between a dog-kennel and civilized society. But he does not recognize the right of others to interfere with his freedom of thought. If his country does something which he believes to be wrong, he gets up and says so, and the government which he attacks will respect him, and will give him full protection against the mob which to-day, as in the time of Socrates, often loves to destroy those who surpass it in courage or intelligence. There never has been a good cause, however unpopular or however distant, which has not counted a number of Englishmen among its staunchest adherents. The mass of the English people are not different from those in other lands. They stick to the business at hand, and have no time for unpractical "sporting ventures." But they rather admire their eccentric neighbour, who drops everything to go and fight for some obscure people in Asia or Africa, and when he has been killed they give him a fine public funeral, and hold him up to their children as an example of valour and chivalry.'

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

A minister whose Bible Classes were usually very successful was amazed to find that a course of lectures on *The Pilgrim's Progress* was not going well. He could not understand why the immortal allegory seemed to demand such labour on his part to evoke intelligent interest on the part of his hearers. At last it occurred to him to ask, 'How many of you have read the book?' The answer astonished him. Not one had ever read it through, very few had read any of it. Hence his failure. He assumed that all would be familiar with the general outline, with the chief characters and the outstanding incidents, while in reality it was all unknown. Has this masterpiece dropped out of popular use? What a pity if it has!

Good books expository of the matchless 'dream' are not few. But there is room for more. We call attention to the little work by Mr. J. Gurr Reid, Assistant in Richmondhill Congregational Church, Bournemouth, *Seeking the City* (Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d. net). It is something new. Its value is out of all proportion to its size. It is not an example of how a literary conjurer can extract to our astonishment undreamt-of things which he himself has slyly put in when we were not looking. It is a genuine unfolding of the rich treasures of Bunyan, not an exhibition of Mr. Reid's cleverness. Not that he is not clever. He is very clever. But he does not know it. He is sure that this old book has great interest and importance for the present day; he brings a wide-awake mind to bear upon it, and in modern language explains its meaning and points its lessons. He does so frequently by apt quotations. He has read widely and has a genius for selecting what is to the point. He does not give a systematic exposition of the whole. He has selected a few of the more noteworthy characters and adventures encountered by the pilgrim. We hope, however, that this is but an earnest of what is to come.

Let us exemplify Mr. Reid's method by summarizing his treatment of Mr. Worldly Wiseman. 'I always associate him in my mind,' says Mr. Reid, 'with Polonius and Major Pendennis,' and he quotes from Thackeray's account of the military gentleman's morality. 'Such as it was, it was consistent. It might not, perhaps, contribute to a man's progress in another world, but it was pretty well calculated to advance his interests in this; and then it must be remembered that the Major never for one instant doubted that his views were the only views practicable. He was a man of honour, in a word; and had his eyes, what he called open. He took pity on this young greenhorn of a nephew, and wanted to open his eyes too.' So Mr. Worldly Wiseman has his good 'gentlemanly' points. He is kind. He is genuinely concerned about Christian's distress. He is sincere in offering the advice he gives. He has no idea of misleading Christian. The very opposite. He is religious, he attends church. 'The wise among the worldly,' says Mr. Reid, 'are not foolish enough to be atheists.' But their worship is just a patronizing of Deity. This grotesque attitude is not uncommon.

Why did Christian yield to worldly-wise advice to give up quixotic enterprises and be content to dwell in the pleasant village of Morality? Well,

he was suffering acutely, and was fain to try anything that promised peace. A certain quiet may be found by adopting the world's standards. Yet 'the worst punishment that comes upon anyone in the village of Morality is to find ease there from the burden once felt.'

Again, the worldly-wise seduction is potent because of the air of authority with which it speaks. The worldly-wise are so calm and confident, so dogmatic and plausible. They are so often the people who 'get on.' They can claim the majority on their side. 'Worldly Society in the aggregate has a kind of hypnotic suggestiveness which we escape only with persistent care.' The third and perhaps deciding factor which turned Christian aside was the reminder that to leave the hard path and abide in Morality involved no separation from kindred and friends. Acquiescence in conventional religion need make no breach in friendships. 'The best way to meet this pull of love and friendship is to make clear to ourselves the truth that in following other than the highest we know, we may involve those for whom we are most solicitous in permanent loss and damage.'

THE RETURN OF CHRISTENDOM.

The Return of Christendom (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) consists of a series of essays by a group of churchmen, with introduction by Bishop Gore, and epilogue by G. K. Chesterton. The writers start from the conviction that the world is above all in need of a unifying principle, for lack of which civilization is rapidly disintegrating. They urge that the discovery of this must involve the restoration in new forms of the mediæval ideal of Christendom, and they find implicit in the Catholic Faith the elements of a distinctive Christian sociology.

The exposition of the Catholic Faith is admirable, and would meet with warm approval in every evangelical church in Christendom. The bias, however, towards Mediævalism is strongly marked. It takes some boldness, in the face of history, to assert that Protestantism destroyed the only world-wide fellowship man has ever known. The excellence of the Mediæval system is held to lie in its proclamation of the supremacy of justice and an all-embracing Kingdom of God. Bracton's saying is quoted, that 'the king has two superiors, God and the law.' These words might be matched by Andrew Melville's more vigorous language to King James. Protestantism is more than mere individualism. Calvin in Geneva, Knox in Scotland, and the Puritans in England have never been surpassed in their ardour to Christianize the whole social order, and establish the Kingdom of God among men.

In dealing with the present social order the essayists indulge in pungent criticisms of Capitalism, while, on the other hand, the defects and fallacies of popular Socialism are not spared. There is a short but really penetrating critique of Marxism.

It is in constructive work that the essays are weakest, as Bishop Gore candidly indicates in the preface. The policy offered is simply a return to craftsmanship, under a system of Guilds, with 'the maintenance of a Just and Fixed Price' to protect the worker against the speculator. No indication is given of how this Just Price is to be fixed and maintained, or of how a community of craftsmen, with fixed prices, are likely to fare in their international relations. An extraordinary corollary of this policy is the proposed regulation of machinery, so that 'the amount of machinery used in the future would be negligible in comparison with what is used to-day.' All machinery involving the subdivision of labour would be scrapped, and what remained would be confined to doing 'the donkey work.' All this, because the workman is becoming the slave of his machine. When the Turk finds himself unable to govern his subjects he falls back on the policy of massacre. It may safely be predicted that man will find other means of maintaining his supremacy over matter than by a wholesale massacre of machinery.

Despite this manifest weakness in constructive work these essays are full of vigorous and suggestive Christian thought, and when they press the great principles of Vocation and Fraternity, both Capital and Labour would do well to give good heed.

THEOSOPHY.

The Rev. W. S. Urquhart, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Philosophy in the Scottish Churches College, Calcutta, has published a book entitled *Theosophy and Christian Thought* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). In the small scope of little over two hundred pages Dr. Urquhart has given a masterly exposition of the main doctrines of theosophy, its relation to science and philosophy, and its religious and ethical value.

Lord Beaconsfield once said, in reference to the progress of politics, 'Keep your eye on Paisley.' We might say in regard to the future of religion, 'Keep your eye on India.' For out of the ashes of the idols there has arisen a religion which claims to be more spiritual than Christianity, more philosophical also, and more scientific. In its most aggressive form it is a recent introduction into India, but it has allied itself with a religion or philosophy which was a power in that country long before Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem. In that alliance lies its present strength and its future prospects. Moreover, it has great adaptability. Its boast is that it can gather to itself all that is good in every religion in the world. And so, while being essentially a religion of the élite, it can appeal to every grade of society and every race of man.

This is the strength of theosophy—its catholicity. Mrs. Besant calls it 'our main policy of perfect tolerance. No person's religious opinions are asked upon his joining, nor is interference with them permitted, but everyone is required to show to the religion of his fellow-members the same respect as he claims for his own.' Here is how Dr. Urquhart puts it: 'If he is a Hindu, he will remain a Hindu, if a Christian, a Christian, if a Buddhist, a Buddhist. By the aid of theosophy he will in fact be more securely entrenched in his ancestral religion, for theosophy will help him to discover its essential meaning and value. The principle of catholicity is laid down repeatedly and with emphasis, and from the theosophical point of view the result is that a man may hold any creed he pleases. We cannot, however, avoid the suspicion that theosophy would impose one limitation—*the creed must not be held too firmly*. If a man grasps his creed firmly, it is thought that he will inevitably become narrow-minded and exclusive, and, in the intensity of his devotion to his own religion, will be apt to deny or despise the truth of others. The possibility of intense devotion being inclusive of the good that is in other religions is not sufficiently considered by theosophists. Rather than run the risk of narrowness, they hold that it is better to have no creed and to sit loose to every form of faith, or at least to allow the outlines of belief to become so indefinite that, even if one's own creed contain elements contradictory to the creed of others, these contradictions will not be uncomfortably apparent. In the dimness of theosophic catholicity it will thus be comparatively easy to assert that all the creeds are but aspects of one universal body of truth.'

But there is another attraction, which is more potent with the masses. That is the promise of occult knowledge and secret power. A very small number of really notable men, *e.g.* Sir William Crookes and M. V. S. Solovyoff, the Russian man of letters, were attracted to Madame Blavatsky by this side of her work, although they soon discovered the hollowness of her claims. But it is this aspect of the system which draws the mass of the devoted theosophists of the West. The sheer fascination of secrecy lays hold of them, the hope of exclusive knowledge, the promise of a path to occult development.

In India and Ceylon, however, it is clear that the great instrument in winning the people to theosophy has been the Society's patronage and defence of Hinduism and Buddhism. Mrs. Besant defends any and every observance of Hinduism however superstitious. It is part of the system.

But let us turn to Theosophy in its relation to Christianity. And let us get back to Dr. Urquhart. We shall quote one paragraph from this fine chapter.

'Theosophy fails to reach a true conception of the uniqueness of Christ and of the miraculousness of His Divinity, because of its general tendency, not only to rest in theory, but to substitute creations of the imagination for objective facts. . . . The theosophist reaches beyond his dreams only to a God who is hidden in the mist of abstractions. He is unable to conceive of a God of personal character, and when the holiness of God as above us and beyond us as well as within us is not realized, moral values become dim and the urgency of the moral demand is weakened. The sense of sin is less acute, and, when there is no consciousness of wrong that has to be put right, there can be no full appreciation of a Divine revelation through sacrifice, and redemption will appear to be superfluous. Within a religion which is based upon a vague sense of identity between the human and the Divine, salvation will be obtainable by deification rather than by sanctification, and in this natural process conversion will hold an unimportant place, and be regarded as of infrequent occurrence. Theosophy is content with chaotic thoughts, because in general it despises the need of an objective standard by the help of which it may reduce this chaos to a cosmos. And, in the more

immediately practical sphere of religion, it does not sufficiently turn its thoughts outwards so that it may grasp the facts of life, including the sin and misery of men. Because in its subjective complacency it does not feel the need of redemption, it does not press onwards to the discovery of the redeemer, as He came to the world of humanity and revealed the loving-kindness of God.'

PHILOSOPHY IN UNDRESS.

The Psychology of Social Life: A Materialistic Study with an Idealistic Conclusion, by Charles Platt, Ph.D., M.D. (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). Here is a book which the plain man has been waiting for, a book on psychology written in the language, if not of the market-place, at least of the Chamber of Commerce. There seems to be no vital necessity for books on even ultimate problems to be written in terms so technical that only a trained student of philosophy can understand them. Most thoughts can be expressed in simple terms, and Dr. Platt is a welcome example of a writer who has something to say on great things, and can say it in words which any educated person can understand. Apart from that his style is unconventional. His pages are full of humour; he draws his numerous illustrations from the homeliest regions; he has a wide knowledge of literature—classical and frivolous—and uses it effectively; and, in short, his book is perfectly delightful to read.

'It is the purpose of this book to prove, if possible, psychology's position, and it is hoped, too, in so doing, to indicate something of man's duty. We learn that man cannot be known unless we know the society in which he lives. We learn that society also can not be known, nor in any way explained, and certainly not controlled, unless we know the man that made it.' It is the latter side of the truth that is stressed here. Society is a derivative from man's psychic need. Society is made by the individual. This, then, suggests the method of the inquiry. It seeks out first the facts about human nature, and then draws deductions from these. In the first part of the book, accordingly, we have a series of chapters dealing in a lively way, and without a dull page, with sex, fear, habit, imitation, convention, tradition, fashion, suggestion, hysteria, and superstition. Aside from the purpose of the book there is rich material here for the preacher on such subjects as fear in religion, the Church, convention, death, religious tradition, and others. For the most part it is all very good. Dr. Platt is not always satisfactory in handling religion, and his chapter on War is inadequate. But on most topics he throws a great deal of light, and his illustrations are extraordinarily good.

The most important part of the book is the general discussion which follows the statement of facts. Society is what man makes it, and therefore a changed society means a necessary change in man. The secret of reform lies in the reform of the individual. That is the general thesis which is stated and vindicated with great ability. It may be guessed what Dr. Platt's attitude to socialism is. Society will never be changed by political reforms. Socialism and democracy both make the mistake of overestimating man's ability. Man is not yet social, and he is not yet wise. Man's egotism and ignorance are facts that cannot be ignored without inviting disaster.

The real path to reform is therefore education, and the key to the future is the child. This is pressed home in the last chapter. Educate, educate, educate, and especially give the greatest necessity of all, religious education in the widest sense of that term. 'Religion is the mainstay of all the people, of men and of nations. Without it man becomes a bit of ingenious machinery.' That may be said to be the conclusion of the whole matter. This is not a religious book. It has not even a religious 'tone.' But it ends in the real thing.

A PRIMITIVE PEOPLE.

Mr. Walter Grainger White has discovered a primitive people. He discovered them by accident. He was acting as chaplain in Burma, and one day he noticed a curious craft approaching the harbour of a seaport where he was visiting. It turned out to belong to the Mawken, the sea gypsies of Malaya, and there and then he began to study this curious folk. He lived among them, learned their language, won their confidence, and found his way into their shy minds. The result is a wonderful book, *The Sea Gypsies of Malaya*, in which he describes their customs, habits, occupations, religion, and language. They are a remnant of a people who formerly inhabited the mainland of Burma. They were driven from their home, and took to the waters of the Archipelago of Mergui with its count-

less islands, becoming an amphibious people. They have been so shy and inaccessible that little has been known of them, and (what is of importance) they have preserved unmodified the thoughts and habits of mind and soul of the primitive stock. Mr. White is a member of the Anthropological Society of Oxford, and his book is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the evolution of the race. It is a fascinating record. The anthropology is well coated with sugar. Mr. White is cautious with the caution of science, but he knows how to be interesting. He tells us that in spite of the hard life the Mawken live they are singularly free from ailments. He found no instance of a Mawken with a cold, a cough, or phthisis. He never saw a blind or deaf or dumb person among them. They have a religion with a belief in a future life, but they have no conception of God. There are spirits who are chiefly hostile. Their religion is a form of animism, and the Great Spirit is so kindly that they count Him a negligible quantity! There is a chapter which gives an extraordinary instance of the power of suggestion. A 'bad man' through this power lived on the possessions of his neighbours. If they refused him anything he put a spell on them, telling them they would suffer this and that; or even that they would die. What he threatened invariably happened. The facts are beyond dispute, and would interest the newer school of psychologists. There are chapters on children's games, on marriage and burial, on medical customs and much else. Mr. White's book is unique of its kind, and combines instruction and amusement in about equal quantities. The publishers are Seeley, Service & Co., and the price is 21s. net.

PSYCHOANALYSIS.

A translation of a course of lectures which were delivered by Professor Charles Baudoin in Geneva at the Jean Jacques Rousseau Institute, and at the Faculty of Letters in the University, has been made by Eden and Cedar Paul under the title of *Studies in Psychoanalysis* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

Psychoanalysis is a method, according to Crichton Miller, of revealing 'to the individual, from his own experience, the unconscious motive that is at work in producing his neuroses.' Professor Baudoin lays less emphasis on the pathological aspect of psychoanalysis. He looks upon it as a method of re-education rather than of cure; and, unlike many psychoanalysts, uses suggestion concurrently with analysis. His position as a whole is refreshingly broadminded.

How does psychoanalysis do its work? It studies sub-conscious mentation. How? Chiefly by the analysis and interpretation of dreams, day-dreams, and reminiscences of childhood, trivial things which have been selected and remembered from among many other trivialities which have been forgotten. Psuedo-reminiscences also, memories which are real only to the subject's consciousness, form matter for analysis. The analysis follows the usual course. The subject narrates his dream—we are confining ourselves to dreams—and in so doing he gives what Freud calls the 'manifest content' of the dream. He next allows his mind to dwell on its main items, and describes to the analyst the associations called up. These associations are the familiar Freudian 'latent content' of the dream. 'You will,' Freud said, 'call up the dreamer's associations till you have penetrated from the substitute to the thought proper for which it stands.' That association may work freely Professor Baudoin says the subject must be in a state of mind which he calls 'contention'—that is, a kind of spontaneous attention as contrasted with reflective attention. But this is only the first part of the psychoanalytic method. After analysis of the dream comes the interpretation of it. 'After penetrating,' Freud said, 'from the substitute to the thought proper for which it stands,' you will 'supply the meaning of the symbols from your own knowledge.' Such a process sounds arbitrary, but psychoanalysts disclaim arbitrariness. However that may be, the interpretation leaves room for considerable divergence between different schools. The associations previously spoken of are symbols, and have to be interpreted. Professor Baudoin's divergence from Freud does not lie in the meaning which he reads into particular symbols, but in his conception of the nature and purpose of symbolization. He does not hold with Freud that symbolization is 'necessarily the outcome of the masking of forbidden representations.' 'I look,' he said, 'upon symbolization as a general law of the imagination.' It is 'a natural result of the working of the laws of condensation and displacement.' Condensation is defined as the 'process whereby images characterized by a common affect are grouped so as

to form a single composite and new image,' and displacement as 'the transference of affect from one idea to another.'

The book is in two parts. The first deals with the theory of psychoanalysis, and the second contains a large number of case histories. The translators recommend the novice to go straight to the case histories, and promise them that thus they will be able to enjoy a course of Psychoanalysis without tears. The theoretical part, they say, is 'written mainly for experts, is of import to them, and will interest them greatly even when they differ from the author.' We agree with the translator, and would heartily commend *Studies in Psychoanalysis* to the attention both of the expert and of the novice in the field.

During the academic year of 1920–21 a seminar was conducted in Yale University for the purpose of studying the history of belief in life after death. Twelve papers were read by eminent specialists in the history of religions. These have now been published under the title of *Religion and the Future Life* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). Six papers are devoted to the exposition of Primitive, Egyptian, Indian, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek ideas of the future life. Four papers are given to the Hebrew and Christian doctrines of immortality.

The Gospel records are treated from the standpoint of radical criticism. The story of the empty tomb is summarily dismissed and the Resurrection faith is based on the teaching of Jesus at the Last Supper, rather than upon a historic event. 'We might almost say it was this doctrine which produced the resurrection visions, rather than the visions which produced the Christian doctrine.' 'The appearances that sent the new faith on its victorious way were not of one issuing from the nether world or from the tomb. What we have of stories of this type is of later date. They concern themselves with the secondary question of debate, ignored by Paul, as to what became of the buried body.' This is not to interpret history but to dissolve it away. Certainly no classical scholar of reputation would dare to treat his sources after this fashion.

In the concluding paper Dr. Sneath, who edits the volume, worthily sums up an impressive discussion, claiming that the belief in a future life has not only secured the universal suffrages of mankind, but has been to man in all ages 'a veritable star of hope, leading him through the long conflict between good and evil.'

Messrs. Angus & Robertson of Sydney have published the Official Report of Proceedings of Reunion Conference between Representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational churches in Australia, holden at the Chapter House, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, N.S.W., on March 28–29, 1922. The title is *Australia and Reunion* (3s.). Four topics were discussed—Episcopacy, Ordination, Possibilities of Immediate Action, and the Creed. And on each topic there was such discussion as would make the Lambeth Conference itself look small. For there was great openness of mind and great plainness of speech. Not once have we come across words that suggested finesse in the choice of them. The feeling of every one of the speakers seems to have been that God desires truth in the inward parts; and that gained, the outward expression follows truth—fully. There are degrees of wisdom as of its utterance. But the Report is a historical document which future historians of the Church in Australia will quote with pride.

It is no wonder that a second edition of *The Cradle of Mankind*, by Sir Edgar and Dr. W. A. Wigram (Black), has been called for. The authors have amply vindicated their contention that 'it takes two people at least to write a book of travel, a newcomer to give the first impressions, and an old resident to reveal the true inwardness of things.' Here are vividly portrayed both the outward aspect of nature and the inwardness of things historical, political, and religious, in that mystic land whose snow-capped mountains feed the great rivers of Mesopotamia.

The second edition is enriched by the addition of two chapters dealing with the years of the War. The deathless story of our Assyrian allies is thrillingly told. The end is tragic. 'One must admit with deep regret that, for these people, the result of joining the Entente in the war has been the utter extinction of a community of Christians who trace back their life to the Magi who came to worship at the manger of Bethlehem.' These chapters should be read by all who desire first-hand information regarding the ways of the unspeakable Turk, and the frightful welter of the Middle East.

Prayer is a difficulty for the logician. The late Professor Henry Jones, who held that all religion was rational, had trouble with it. But the difficulty of difficulties is intercessory prayer. Yet the Rev. Conrad H. Goodwin, M.A., B.D., has written a book on *The Force of Intercession* (Boston: Stratford Publishing Company), in which he proves that intercession for others is the act of a reasonable being. He adds argument to argument convincingly, just as if there were no mystery in it.

The book is intensely interesting. New avenues of thought are opened up, and they are seen to have eternal issues. Each step in a fully-planned purpose is taken carefully. Central thoughts are expressed in sentences that ought to be memorized. Thus: 'Intercession is the sense of kinship with God put to service for others.' 'Hence our intercession is not the movement of our individual, isolated soul toward God. It means God's Source-life in us reaching up to the Source-life outside us. It means God's Spirit of kinship in us offering itself to those outside ourselves. For this Spirit of God in us is *one* Spirit everywhere. With powerful intent He would awaken in all men that force and joy of His fellowship which we feel in prayer.'

Under the title of *Christian Spirituality* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 10s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. Pourrat gives what is practically a history of Monasticism from the time of our Lord till the dawn of the Middle Ages. It is intended to complete the work in two subsequent volumes, which will bring the history down to the present day.

Spirituality or Spiritual Theology is distinguished from Dogmatic Theology, which teaches what we believe, and from Moral Theology, which teaches what we should or should not do to avoid sin. It teaches the doctrine and practice of evangelical perfection. It is divided into Ascetic Theology and Mystical Theology, the former treating of the exercises required of aspirants to perfection, the latter, of those ineffable experiences which flood the soul with Divine light and love.

'Must we conclude that Jesus excluded the mass of Christians from perfection to make it the privilege of only a few?' The answer is a bold affirmative. To those who can accept this tremendous assumption the record of monastic thought and practice, its voluntary poverty, chastity, and clean-cut renunciation of the world, must appear inspiring, and its wildest excesses easily pardonable. To Dr. Pourrat the telling of the story is manifestly a labour of love, and these ancient rules and practices are set down as the surest guide to the topmost heights of the Christian life. No reader with imagination can fail to be impressed with the spiritual force that impelled this tremendous reaction from the lewdness of ancient pagan life. The translators have done their work to admiration.

One of the earliest volumes of the original Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges was Plumptre's *Ecclesiastes*. It has held its place till now. But it will not do any longer. For on Ecclesiastes we have not only learned much but unlearned more. So a new edition has been issued, written on the Revised Version by the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., Canon of Ely (Cambridge: at the University Press; 6s.).

The Book of Esther, it has been said, is worth retaining in the Canon for the sake of a single verse. The Book of Ecclesiastes has a whole chapter to defend it—that wonderful twelfth, with its pathetic description of extreme old age. Dr. Lukyn Williams has given his strength to the exposition of it. For it bristles with difficulties, which, strangely, take nothing away from its pathos. There is that fifth verse with its three perplexing clauses: 'the almond tree shall blossom, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and the caperberry shall fail.' For the second, Dr. Williams prefers the translation of the Revised Version margin: 'the grasshopper shall drag itself along,' as a burden. 'The image,' he says, 'is that of a locust crawling along with some difficulty—*either* because it is still in its *larva* or in its *pupa* state, before it has finally moulted and become a perfect locust (see Dr. on *Joel*, p. 86 sq.), *or* because the morning is still cold and wet (Nah. iii. 17). It cannot fly, though it would like to do so, it can only drag itself along. So is it with the old man. He has lost all his alertness of body and of mind.'

'Whatever else education may bring, it must bring willingness to endure pain, to practise meditation, to keep silence. It will not, of course, teach men that they should look for nothing but pain, take no exercise but meditation, or keep silence for ever; but it may teach them that in silence some meanings may be communicated which words will not carry; that meditation may be had, not only in cloisters but in crowds, by those who would

bring their minds to an athletic vigour under its discipline; that pain is a common possession. It is thus that loneliness, felt and guessed, becomes a pledge and bond of society, that individuality becomes significant. . . . If education is a process, its prizes are the sum of the experience which a man has gained not at the end of the process (for he never attains the end), but at any point at which he may have arrived.' This is from the concluding chapter of a really fine book, *Society and Solitude* (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net), by E. T. Campagnac, Professor of Education in Liverpool. It is a philosophy of Life given in a series of chapters beautiful in diction, suggestive in thought, high in purpose. It is something of a twentieth century Plato's *Republic*. We regret the high price, which will confine to a limited circulation a book which should be in the hands of all classes.

In *Altars of Earth* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net), the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, M.A., has made a charming contribution to 'The Humanism of the Bible' Series. The major part of the book deals with the early stories of Genesis, and sets forth finely their imperishable value and beauty. The pious hope is expressed that 'surely at last we are to be delivered from the noise of theologizing archers in our drawing of water from the wells of salvation.' But the writer himself is a keen archer, and never misses the chance of letting fly a bolt. Perhaps his end might have been still better served had he ignored the noise of the archers and led the way to green pastures and still waters, far from the din and dust of strife.

The last seven chapters contain a fresh and sympathetic study of Ecclesiastes. The Preacher is shown to be no cynic nor tired voluptuary, but a soul of rare honesty and tender sensibility. The treatment is modern in the best sense, and the style is enriched with many apt quotations and literary allusions.

What has criticism left of the Old Testament? How are we now to understand, use and teach it? Read Professor McFadyen's book, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s.), and you will get all such perplexities cleared up. He shows how there is nothing to be dreaded from criticism, that nothing that ever really mattered to anybody has been lost, that the old Book is still what our fathers found it—a source of light, comfort, and strength.

Get the right man and you get the right book. This is the secret of the place which such a work as the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS has taken. It is the secret of the success of Messrs. Constable's 'Philosophies Ancient and Modern.' The choice for *Plato* (2s. net) is Professor A. E. Taylor of St. Andrews. It may be that Professor Taylor is most masterful in such a philosophical and religious subject as Theism, contributed by him to the Encyclopædia, but he is known as one who takes all philosophy and all religion as his province, and Professor Burnet himself could not have done better with Plato in the space.

'It is the shepherd instinct that is the greatest quality in Edgar De Witt Jones. He loves people. He believes in them. He invests even the unworthiest of them with dignity. And in the spirit of Jesus he delights to serve them. He is a real pastor.' So says Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century*, in a foreword to a book of sermons by Dr. Jones—*When Jesus Wrote on the Ground* (Doran; $1.50 net). It is significant, then, that the first sermon in the book is on John 13^{1-4}. Its title is 'The Towel and the Basin.' Dr. Jones preaches Christ with grace and persuasion. But one can well believe that the printed page withholds something of his personality.

Has the Church any help to bring to a world that is so obviously in distress? Undoubtedly. Precisely for that does she exist. But if she is to help in any real sense, she must have clear ideas as to what is wrong with the world. Many attempts have been made recently to aid us to understand the problems of our time. One of the best we have seen is by Mr. Sherwood Eddy, who calls his book *Facing the Crisis* (New York: Doran; $1.50). Written specifically for America, it will be found most applicable to Europe. For, after all, it is just our common human nature that is wrong, just human nature that constitutes the problem. Clear, concise, and suggestive, this little work deserves a large circulation.

A new volume of Mr. Boreham's Essays. Or should it be 'Sermons'? If you are a preacher you will call them sermons, and be grateful for

them. You will be grateful for their suggestiveness, their grace and imagination. Especially their imagination, for it stimulates your own. And without imagination no sermon can escape dulness.

George Dawson, one of the most vivid and interesting preachers of the last generation, once said to Dale of Birmingham, 'When I speak I make up my mind that the people shall listen to me: if they do not listen it does not matter what I say.' Dale, of course, agreed; and in repeating the story says that one curious fact about dulness is, that there are men who have imagination enough but never use it in the pulpit. 'Let them speak at a political meeting,' he says, 'or indeed at a meeting of any kind, and their speeches are bright with fancy and warm with generous excitement; memory, wit, imagination, are all alert and active; they make the most felicitous quotations from ancient and modern poets; they remember wise and noble sentences in Plato, in Hooker, in Jeremy Taylor, in Pascal; they are familiar with Sir Walter Scott and with Nathaniel Hawthorne and with Charles Dickens; they have a humorous tale to tell which they have met with in some book of travels; or they remind you of a pathetic story which you saw in the newspaper the day before; or they have an adventure of their own to describe, and you are moved to laughter or tears. But let them begin to preach and everything is changed.' And why? Because they do not take imagination with them into the pulpit.

We have said that Mr. Boreham stimulates the imagination. Here is one way that he does it. By leaving something for the imagination to work upon. He does not explain everything.

'A mother, reading a poem to a boy of six, said, "I'm afraid you can't understand it, dear"; to which the prompt reply was, "Oh yes, I can, very well, if only you would not explain."'

Do we as preachers explain too much? It is good to send people home thinking over what has been said. It is good also that they should think over what has not been said.

But there are other ways. You will find them in all Mr. Boreham's books. You will find them in his latest, *Shadows on the Wall* (Epworth Press; 5s. net).

A commendation from the Bishop of Ely introduces a small *Service for Infants* (Heffer & Sons; 9d. net), produced by Miss B. I. Devereux. The book is intended for use in Anglican Sunday Schools 'after the usual morning school is over, in place of taking the children to Matins.' It is prefixed by simple directions which prove the writer to be in sympathy with the child-mind. Here is an example:

'Teacher, my Daddy has got no work to do?
Very well, we will pray that he may get some.'

This booklet is another step in the direction of graded worship.

Without a volume by Professor A. T. Robertson of Louisville, Kentucky, the season's output would have fallen short of completeness. This time it is a study of certain *Types of Preachers in the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). Although he calls them preachers it is not as preachers that Professor Robertson studies them, it is as men (and women). Some of them we do not know as preachers at all—Philemon, Lydia, Judas Iscariot, Diotrephes. Never mind. The studies are interesting, and the very latest idea of the very latest commentator or critic is recorded.

Professor George Milligan may be trusted to give a great deal of information in little space and in most pleasant form. This is borne out by his new publication, *Here and There among the Papyri* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). The romantic story of the discovery of ancient papyri preserved in the sand of Egypt is well told, and the extraordinary interest and variety of their contents so indicated that one longs for more. The 'finds' have been very valuable as revealing the language, life, and thought of the common people of a remote past, and as casting fresh and sometimes new light on a multitude of New Testament passages or words. We know now that the census and the census regulations of Lk $2^{2f.}$ are perfectly genuine, and that the 'blotting out' of Col. 2^{14} is equivalent to our 'cleaning the slate.' The book is quite a storehouse of such information.

A handsome and unexpectedly cheap book has been published by Edward Howell Ltd., Liverpool, under the title *Rambles Round the Old Churches of Wirral* (8s. 6d. net). The author is Charles W. Budden, M.D. The volume is delightfully printed and illustrated. Twenty full-page photographs

appear in it and four original pen-drawings by the author.

The Rev. Canon Brooke Gwynne, M.A., Rural Dean of Wirral, has written the Introduction. 'There are,' he says, 'Cathedrals abroad which may be more beautiful than our own, but the Parish Churches of England are unique in Europe. For strength, picturesqueness, and architectural beauty they are unsurpassed. They also have another interest for us. The Parish Churches were ever the centre of the social, as well as the religious, life of the people. Dr. Budden has presented this double picture with discrimination, knowledge, and skill.'

The author's arrangement of his topics is ingenious. Chapters I. and II. treat of the evolution and architecture of the churches. Chapter III. deals with the 'Bells' which summon us to the church. Chapter IV. brings us through the 'Churchyard' to the porch. Chapter V. follows with the theme 'Wirral Church Dedications,' because 'it establishes the sanctity of the buildings we are about to enter.' But no unbaptized person could enter a church. So we have Chapter VI. 'The old Fonts of Wirral.' Chapter VII. discusses the pulpit and the pew, and Chapter VIII. is in harmony, with a talk on 'Old Bibles and Books in Wirral Churches.'

Dr. Budden, continuing to follow his system of Christian development, now brings us to the stage of full church membership. So Chapters IX., X., XI., XII. deal with the Altar, Church Plate, and Chancel Relics. Chapter XIII. embarks on the subject of Hatchments and Heraldic Panels. And, finally, we have a chapter on 'Stained Glass in Wirral Old Churches,' a 'fitting epilogue,' as the author puts it, 'since, through the medium of this form of art, we are given a pictorial summary of the Christian life.'

It is a book, primarily, for Wirral. But every chapter has its interest for a larger public.

Mr. Murray has published the addresses of Presidents of Sections as delivered at the 90th Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Hull in September, 1922. The title is *The Advancement of Science*, 1922 (6s.).

To the unscientific it is not so attractive as last year's volume. For one thing, Darwinism, disowned last year, is contemptuously ignored this year. The scientific presidents are all evolutionists, but it is clear that one man's evolution is as different from another man's as Dean Rashdall's theology differs from Dean Wace's. The most readable paper is that of the President of the Association, Sir C. S. Sherrington. The subject, under the unlikely title of 'Some Aspects of Animal Mechanism,' is the connexion between the nerves and the mind. The nexus between the two is strict, but 'for comprehension of its nature we still require, it seems, comprehension of the unsolved mystery of the how of life itself.' Again, 'the how of the mind's connection with its bodily place seems still utterly enigma. Similarity or identity in time-relations and in certain other ways between mental and nervous processes does not enlighten us as to the actual nature of the connection existent between the two. Advance in biological science does but serve to stress further the strictness of the nexus between the two.'

Professor G. H. Hardy, on 'The Theory of Numbers,' opens hopefully. 'I propose to try to say something to you about something about which I have something to say.' Ah, would the preacher could follow this wise divine's instructions! And then he confesses the abysm of his ignorance. After asking some simple questions, he says: 'There is no one of them to which I know the answer, nor, so far as I know, does any mathematician in the world; and there is no one of them, with one exception which I have included deliberately, the answer to which any one of us would not make almost any sacrifice to know.'

The latest series of the James Sprunt Lectures was delivered by the Hon. William Jennings Bryan. The title is *In His Image* (Oliphants; 7s. net).

The James Sprunt Lectures are delivered at the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia. The first three lecturers were Dr. D. J. Burrell, Sir W. M. Ramsay, and Professor James Stalker. Thus they opened well and got a name. Mr. Bryan's volume proves that the freedom of utterance allowed the lecturer is limitless. Mr. Bryan rejects Criticism of the Bible high and low, rich and poor. Much more emphatically, and just as sweepingly, he rejects Darwinism, and even Evolution. His condemnation of the teacher who teaches these things is unsparing. Perhaps it is occasionally mistaken. He says: 'It is *guessing* by scientists and so-called scientists that is doing the harm. And it is *guessing*

that is endorsed by this distinguished college president (a D.D., too, as well as an LL.D. and a Ph.D.) when he says, "I go so far as to say that, if you cannot reconcile religion with the things taught in biology, in psychology, or in the other fields of study in this university, then you should throw your religion away." What does this mean, except that the books on biology and on other scientific subjects used in that university are to be preferred to the Bible in case of conflict?' May it not possibly mean no more than that such a conflict does not occur?

Away from such matters, however, into the practical duties of life, Mr. Bryan is most effective. There is a swing of the arm in every sentence that makes the truth, when it is truth, tell impressively.

To the discussion of Miracles, a discussion which is likely to last for a little time longer, a contribution of value has been made by Mr. E. R. Micklem, M.A., B.Litt. (Oxon). Mr. Micklem confines his study to the healing miracles of the New Testament, and the question that he keeps before him is, Can these miracles be explained psychologically? That seems to be as much as to ask, Are they miracles? But that is so only if a miracle is to be defined as a violation of natural law. If a healing miracle, such as the cure of the man born blind, was due to psychical power possessed by Jesus beyond that of His contemporaries, it would certainly be a miracle to them. And if it was due to psychical power beyond that which we possess now it would still be a miracle to us.

The first thing, however, to establish is the fact that the cures reported in the Gospels were actually wrought by Christ. Mr. Micklem accomplishes that, and it is a valuable accomplishment. He is especially careful and especially convincing on the cases of possession by demons. The title of his book is *Miracles and the New Psychology* (Oxford: at the University Press; 7s. 6d. net).

A book on the fulfilment of prophecy has been written by Mr. J. Charleton Steen. The title is *God's Prophetic Programme* (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net).

The Pilgrim Press have issued the forty-third annual volume of *Young England* (7s. 6d. net). It is a boy's magazine, and therefore there are stories of adventure and historical tales. It is for active young minds, and therefore there are pages of absorbing interest about great men and great things and all about how to do things and make things like a model light-ship, or the fitting up of a 'dark room.' In one word, this is an ideal boy's magazine.

Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons are the publishers of a series entitled 'Common Commodities and Industries.' The latest issue is a volume on *Alcohol* (3s. net), by Mr. Charles Simmonds, O.B.E., B.Sc., late superintending Analyst in the Government Laboratory, London.

Those of us who dislike being disturbed, in conscience or in comfort, will find relief in the fact that Prohibition is not once named throughout the book. The subject is alcohol in commerce and industry. The brewers and distillers even may take heart from the fact that alcohol is represented as really a good creature of God *if it is used in the right way*. Use it as you use petroleum and it will serve you well. Its future as a beverage may be short and dishonourable, but there is a great future for it as a chemical agent and motive power.

Mr. Frank G. Jannaway is an enthusiastic Zionite —if that word is applicable to a Gentile. He believes that Palestine belongs to the Jews, and that it will be good for the Jews and for Palestine if they are restored to it. In this does he not differ from the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews? Let that pass. Mr. Jannaway has written a book on *Palestine and the World* (Sampson Low; 7s. 6d. net), in which he uses all his natural eloquence to encourage the Jews to enter once more into the Promised Land. The book is good, but the illustrations within it are better. We do not know where to send you for illustrations of *modern* Jerusalem that would for a moment compare with them.

The Bross Lectures for 1921 were delivered by five different lecturers, and dealt with five different subjects. They are brought together into one volume under the generous title of *Christianity and Problems of To-day* (Scribner; $1.25).

First, Dr. John Huston Finley discourses discursively on things in general, using the uncommitting title of 'From generation to generation.' For he is of the same opinion as the 'distinguished university president who said a few nights ago in my hearing that the world needs a "bath in the obvious."' Three sayings seem to him especially

appropriate to the present state of the world. First, the saying of Crœsus when Cyrus asked him why he had gone to war. Directed by the oracle, he said, 'For no man in his senses would prefer war to peace; since in peace the sons bury their fathers, whereas in war the fathers bury their sons.' Next, the 'utterance by President Fisher, of England's Board of Education, made in the midst of the war, when the days were darkest: "Education is the eternal debt which Maturity owes to Youth."' And, lastly, 'the lines of Gilbert Murray, whom I saw the same day, taken from the lips of Hecuba:

> God, to Thee
> I lift my praise, seeing the silent road
> That bringeth justice ere the end be trod
> To all that breathes and dies.'

The other lecturers and their lectures must be named: Professor Charles Foster Kent on 'Jesus' Social Plan,' Principal Robert Bruce Taylor on 'Personal Religion and Public Morals,' Dr. Paul Elmer More on 'Religion and Social Discontent,' and Dr. Jeremiah W. Jenks on 'The Teachings of Jesus as Factors in International Politics, with Especial Reference to Far-Eastern Problems.'

Mr. A. B. Brewster has quite accurately described his book, *The Hill Tribes of Fiji* (Seeley; 21s. net), as 'a record of forty years' intimate connection with the tribes of the mountainous interior of Fiji, with a description of their habits in war and peace, methods of living, characteristics mental and physical, from the days of cannibalism to the present time.' It is a book full of interest, because it is written with the eye on the object by one who knows his subject inside and out. The feature of the book is its rich treasure of folk-lore. The student of comparative religion will find an endless store of facts in these somewhat diffuse but fascinating chapters. The sense of sin, *e.g.*, is very keen among the Fijians, and the conviction that a close connexion exists always between suffering and sin. But the sin that causes calamity can be purged by confession, by atonement, and by punishment. One of the early missionaries, Mr. Baker, was killed and eaten by the cannibal Fijians and the delinquents were not discovered. Thirty years afterwards, however, the son of the chief offender suffered a train of illnesses and misfortunes, and took these as a clear expression of the wrath of Heaven. He decided to make atonement for his father, and did this in a public service of the Wesleyan Church. Transgressors against the law also regard the trespass as sufficiently purged by the punishment, and, after a sojourn in gaol, regard themselves, and are regarded by their friends, as completely respectable members of society. One curious custom obtained which reminds us of the cities of refuge in the Old Testament. A large stone was placed in the middle of a village, at which malefactors would take refuge. Once a man who had done wrong got on top of it he was safe. His pursuers would say to him, 'Your life is spared, not because you are innocent, but because you are on the Rock of Refuge.'

If any one were disposed to assert the essential goodness of human nature he would find some support in this work. The Fijians have a keen sense of honour. A prisoner was being conveyed to gaol, but it was extremely inconvenient for his guard to accompany him all the way. The guard therefore handed over the warrant, route paper, and handcuffs to the delinquent with a request that he would 'be of a good spirit' and deliver himself up. Which he did! This is one of many stories Mr. Brewster tells that make one wonder whether civilization is altogether an advantage. This sense of honour is part of the simplicity of the people, of which we have many delightful instances in these pages. The book is admirably illustrated by photographs and an excellent map.

Some years ago there appeared a book which at once took its place as one of the greatest of missionary biographies. It was the *Life and Explorations of F. S. Arnot*, and the writer was Ernest Baker. It was a big book, but not too big, because it was about a big man, and the author had one of the most fascinating stories to tell that any man could wish for. And now Mr. Baker has retold the story for young people in *Arnot: A Knight of Africa* (Seeley; 3s. 6d. net). There is no need to say much more than this. Arnot was an explorer and a hero, a man without fear, because his faith was the faith of a child. His was a heroic life, and his work was epoch-making both for geography and for the Kingdom of God. It is well that the rising generation should know the story, and it could not be better told than by its original author.

A lady once said to Robert Browning, 'What a

pity it is, Mr. Browning, that romance has vanished from the world.' To which Browning gravely replied, 'I should make an exception of Camberwell.' Yes, there is romance everywhere, in the most unlikely places, and it has not been hard for Mr. C. R. Gibson to find it in coal. He has written a book, *The Romance of Coal* (Seeley; 6s. net), which contains everything that is to be known about coal and its uses in industry, art, and science. There is no exaggeration in calling the story a romance. When you have passed with Mr. Gibson from the coal-bed up to the outer air and seen on the way the advent of the steam-engine, the development of the coal-mine, the working of iron, the uses of coal dust, and see all around the by-products of coal-tar, you begin to wonder if there is anything anywhere that does not come from coal. It would take a column to describe the daughters of coal-tar alone, from Turkey Red to T.N.T. explosives, dye stuffs, and local anæsthetics. They are all here, and all turned into poetry.

The Rev. Ernest Clapton, M.A., Vicar of Hatherden, has spent much time collecting all the Old Testament quotations and allusions in the Gospels. And it was well-spent time. For in his small book entitled, *Our Lord's Quotations from the Old Testament* (Skeffingtons; 1s. 6d. net), he has given complete lists, first of the direct quotations, next of the references to persons and historical events, then of Scriptures fulfilled, and lastly of indirect quotations and allusions. And he has set it all forth in the most accurate and accessible arrangement. In short chapters in the latter half of the book he discusses points that arise, including (very briefly) the permanent value of the Old Testament.

Sketches of men and movements which he has met or shared in are drawn with a deft hand by the Rev. F. Paton Williams, Vicar of Crawshawbooth. The title is, *The Men of To-day and the Things that Matter* (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Williams is up to date. This paragraph, for example, might have been found in one of the addresses delivered at the meeting of the British Association:

'As Canon Peter Green has pointed out: "There is much less that is miraculous in wireless telegraphy and flying machines than in the fact that if I say to a man in a restaurant, 'Pass me the salt, please,' he will do it." You can explain wireless rays and aeroplanes by mechanical law, but the fact that a mental act can give rise to a bodily act is no nearer being explained to-day, and no more capable of being brought within the conception of a mechanical universe, than it was in the days of Newton.'

'One of the greatest needs of our time,' says Dean Inge in his latest work, 'is a standard book on the doctrine of immortality. It would be a life's work for any man, and the author would have to be both a philosopher and a historian.' Mr. A. Gordon James has just written a book on this subject, with the title, *Personal Immortality: An Enquiry into the Christian Doctrine of a Future Life* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). He would probably not claim that he has written the book the Dean is looking for, but at any rate he has done a useful thing in a workmanlike fashion. A severe critic would perhaps describe the treatment as slight. The chapters are short, and a good deal of ground is covered in them; but the author has used the space at his disposal, in our opinion rightly, for a method which is suggestive and not exhaustive. One excellent feature of his discussion is the thorough way in which he has discarded notions of the future which are traditional and popular, but are entirely out of harmony with modern knowledge. Such, *e.g.*, is the geographical idea of a Heaven and a Hell. Another commendable virtue of this book is its cautious and fair statement of the evidence. One of the best chapters is the first, in which the writer provides a background for faith in immortality by a discussion of 'preliminary facts,' man's universal craving for a future, the breakdown of the materialistic explanation of the universe and the explorations of modern psychology and psychical research. The most interesting part of the writer's argument is that in which he vindicates in its fullest sense the doctrine of the communion of the saints, and puts in a modest plea for prayers for the dead. Altogether, this book is one to be heartily commended as a fresh and vivid guide over a difficult and vital region of thought.

Light and humorous is the Lecture on *The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans*, by Claude Jenkins, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). But the lightness of the touch does not hide the height of the author's learning, nor the humour his sense of responsibility to the truth.

Here is a subject of which the student of Church History knows little. Approaching it through this book he will add to his knowledge as well as to his enjoyment, and he may be led to pursue the matter till he becomes interested enough to take it up as his special study.

The Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, M.A., Canon of Coventry, has published a book of Sermon Outlines on St. Mark's Gospel. He has given it the title, *In the Footsteps of the Master* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). Each sermon is approximately page-length, with a short introductory paragraph, and, generally three divisions of the subject. Mk 4^{38}, 'He was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow,' is divided thus—1. The Sleep of Exhaustion; 2. The Sleep of Relaxation; 3. The Sleep of Confidence.

The 89th volume of *The Child's Own Magazine* has just been published by the Sunday School Union (2s. net), and the fact that it is in its ninetieth year is sufficient to prove its quality and its fitness for its purpose. It is altogether delightful, letterpress and illustrations alike, and cheap at the price.

'The Strangest Figure' in the War.

By Professor James Stalker, D.D., Aberdeen.

The Germans were so ill-off for allies during the War, and so conscious that the civilized world condemned them, that it was not without importance to them that even a single man of distinction, outside the circle of their own natives, took their part and vindicated their action; and it is no wonder that they should still be doing honour to the one man who did so. This was an American, Caspar René Gregory. His words in defence of Germany were published in all the German and Austrian newspapers; congratulations to him on his seventieth birthday, which fell during the War, poured in from every quarter through the same channels; when he died, fighting for Germany, obituary notices, full of laudation, appeared; and, since his death, a biography has been published by Karl Josef Friedrich, of which the copy in my hands is of the second edition. Not only is it written with skill and enthusiasm, but it is illustrated with engravings of a highly symbolical character, the strain of which may be inferred from the account, penned by the artist himself, of the last: 'Victorious and beautiful is the close of Gregory's life. He died as a soldier of Christ. But it is with difficulty that the soul disengages itself from the earthly hull—away from the weakness of man and forth to the everlasting God. The kind hands of the Eternal are receiving the hero.'

The first time I saw the name of Caspar René Gregory was in the *Systematic Theology* of Professor Charles Hodge, in which acknowledgment was made by the author of the assistance he had received from a youthful friend of this name in bringing out the volumes and especially in preparing the Index, which appeared as a separate volume. Gregory was a native of Philadelphia, where his father was the head of a school, in which the son taught for three years before proceeding to Princeton for the study of theology, and it was during a prolonged course at Princeton Seminary that he rendered to the most famous member of the faculty the service above mentioned. He came in contact, too, at Cambridge, with Ezra Abbot, who did not a little to direct his mind towards the line of study which was to become the absorbing interest of his life. But his mind, like that of many another divinity student of his time, was bent on Germany; and, in 1873, he arrived in Leipzig, little thinking that he was never to have another home for the rest of his life. Tischendorf was one of the professors there, and was then at the height of his fame as a New Testament scholar through the publication of the Codex Sinaiticus; but he died in the following year; and Gregory became heir to the task, which he had left uncompleted, of bringing out the eighth edition of his New Testament. For the finishing of this undertaking no less a period than eighteen years proved to be needed; and by this time Gregory had become thoroughly immersed in the work of collecting and collating manuscripts of the New Testament with which his name will always be identified.

He inspected more such manuscripts than any other living man, travelling incessantly to such centres as Paris, Oxford and Cambridge, where the manuscripts were to be found, and going in quest of these treasures of the scholar as far as Egypt and Mount Sinai. He wrote extensively on his subject, and he had the good fortune to make one or two discoveries of the kind by which even the ears of the general public are reached, such as a peculiar ending of the Gospel of St. Mark, found by him at Mount Athos in 1886, and a logion of our Lord not included in the finds of Grenfell and Hunt: but his *magnum opus* was to have been an international edition of the New Testament, in which he sought the co-operation of no fewer than four hundred scholars; but, alas, this has now to be numbered among the enterprises of learning which have been frustrated through the War.

When he went first to Leipzig, he acted for a time as pastor in the American Church. For a number of years he was one of the editors of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. But, as the work which he was doing for biblical palæography became known, the authorities of the university provided for him occupation and maintenance in an honorary professorship, in which he passed through the usual grades of Privatdocent, Extraordinarius and Ordinarius. Five times was a doctor's degree conferred on him by different universities, and he received but rejected tempting offers of chairs in his native country at Cambridge, Chicago and Baltimore. He frequently visited America, to deliver courses of lectures on his favourite subjects; and, on one of these occasions, he married a daughter of Professor Thayer, of Andover, the famous New Testament lexicographer.

It must have been early in this Leipzig period that I lunched in a Berlin restaurant with him and another student who has since attained to fame or notoriety through having a personal encounter in theology with no less an opponent than the German Emperor, and through the violence of the attacks which he has been making since the War on the Old Testament—Professor Delitzsch, son of the Old Testament commentator and himself an eminent assyriologist. What was most noticeable about Gregory at that time was that he would not speak a single word of English, though the German which he spoke was of a peculiar American blend. In subsequent years he wrote indifferently in German or English, publishing some works in both languages. His best known work is entitled *Canon and Text of the New Testament*, and it is acknowledged by experts to be up to the level of the celebrated series in which it appears—'The International Theological Library,' published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh. When Wellhausen, late in life, turned from the criticism of the Old Testament to that of the New, Gregory entered the lists against him with a spirited little volume on the Gospel of St. John, utilizing knowledge which he had acquired in his own early years through rendering into English Luthardt's *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, as well as his commentary, in three volumes, on the same Gospel, thus proving the truth of Goethe's remark, that it is always good to know something.

He never, as far as one can make out, attained to great success as a professor, at least in the sense of drawing very large classes; but this may be explained by the nature of the subjects on which he lectured, these possessing only a limited appeal. But the testimony is strong and universal, that he was a remarkable personality, and that he created in his environment the impression of the presence of a good man. German students, accustomed to a great deal of professional dignity in their instructors, were captivated with a professor who could be seen on the streets with his hat dangling in his hand or with no hat at all, or who received them in his study with a salutation flung from the top of a ladder, on which he was exploring the upper shelves of his bookcases. He greeted every one whom he met on his way to and from the university, whether gentle or simple; he would lift the too heavy load of an apple-woman and carry it to her door, or look after the tramway horses whilst the driver was consuming his meal. He wore coats provided with innumerable pockets, in which were stored twine, sticking-plaster, measuring tape, and other necessaries with which to succour any accident he might encounter on the way. The portrait which the biography contains has an aspect of uncommon cheerfulness and benevolence; and Professor von Harnack, who was for several years contemporary with him in the Leipzig faculty, has borne witness that he never knew another who practised so habitually the imitation of Christ.

It was easy for one who had been brought up in America to be at the front in Germany of the progressive party in politics, and he was no less original and enterprising in the promotion of

religion. He attended regularly the annual gathering of the Friends of the Christian World, where he was a speaker and formed friendships with men and women interested in social advance. He was in the fullest sympathy with the efforts of such leaders as Stöcker and Naumann, and he organized clubs for working-men in his own neighbourhood, where he stimulated social aspiration, yet endeavoured to counteract the atheistical tendencies in the German Social Democracy. He went very far in urging the Church to meet the Socialists halfway, and he was specially impressed with the necessity of winning the children for the Christian Church.

When the War broke out in 1914, it might have been expected that Gregory could have nothing to do with it, as he was long past the age of military service, and his duties at the university demanded his presence. But he was seized with a strange uneasiness, as if he could not keep away from the field of action when great issues were to be decided; and, after ten days of consideration, he went and offered himself to the military authorities. A volunteer of sixty-seven might have been regarded as a ridiculous figure; a volunteer with Gregory's position and antecedents, however, was not to be rejected; for he could express to the world the convictions which were in him. He did issue a declaration of war of considerable length, and it was bitterly anti-British. In a war with France alone he would not have taken part, he said, or even perhaps in one with France and Russia united; but, when England came in—"England, the country of selfishness; England, which murdered the Boer women and children; England, which had brutally oppressed Ireland for centuries; England, which sucked the blood of India, and allowed its inhabitants to perish with hunger—as soon as it was made clear that England was standing behind France and Russia, every one, I said to myself, who can carry a musket must go."

When a youth in Philadelphia he had just missed serving in the American War, and the remains of the training he had then received were in his bones, so that he did not require long to be perfected in the necessary evolutions. He entered the army as a private, and in the biography the steps are minutely traced by which he rose to the rank of officer. With his fellow-privates he was quite at home, and not a few of his younger comrades displayed towards him an affectionate respect. When one who was a vegetarian, a teetotaller and a non-smoker appeared at the officers' mess, the welcome he received was not always flattering. But there was so much of good humour in his bearing of trials, calling himself a maid-of-all-work, that in general he was regarded with a kind of amused wonder, and many a story about the grey-haired volunteer was in circulation through the ranks. Various were the duties assigned to him; but, for the greater part of the time he was serving, he was entrusted with the burial of the dead and the care of the graves; and in such an office the punctual habits of his life enabled him to excel. Many a time he found and conveyed home the bodies belonging to families which corresponded with him about their dead; and, when he found on a dead enemy a letter with an address, he would post it to a mother in France.

It may have been because he was unaccustomed to riding that, towards the close, he fell from his horse, suffering an injury to a limb which occasioned him much pain. But worse was to follow. He was at a town of the name of Neufchapel, not far from Rheims, when the shot and shell of the enemy became exceedingly severe. On 9th April 1917, a shell burst through the wall which separated his bedroom from the place in which his batman was sleeping, and a splinter, entering Gregory's side, caused his death the same day.

The most tragic feature of the whole story is revealed by comparing this date with the date on which America entered the War—6th April 1917—for this proves that he must have known for several days that his native country had declared war on his adopted country. In fact, a son and daughter of his own were at the time in America; he had nephews in the American army; and it was pretty certain that some of his kith and kin would be crossing the ocean to participate in the conflict on the opposite side. Even the German biographer has the grace to see and acknowledge that, in these circumstances, it was better that Gregory was not longer spared.

This Gregory episode is not likely to be forgotten in Germany, but will be made to shine in popular histories of the late war and be told to children and children's children; and, although we know that at the critical moment he committed a fatal mistake, we will not allow this to dim the memory of the scholar's labours and sacrifices in clearing the sacred text from the accumulations of human infirmity, or to cloud our belief that the service which he rendered to the Word of the Lord was inspired by love to the Lord of the Word.

Recent Foreign Theology.

French Theology.[1]

The East through Western Eyes is an appetizing title for a critical essay, especially when its authors are the writers of a well-known life of Mohammed. But it is somewhat spacious for this little work, which is really a cry of protest from two devout Moslems at what they feel to be the irreverence with which certain Western scholars handle the Prophet and other personalities and matters, to them very sacred.

Sometimes, as in the case of that indefatigable student of Mohammedanism, Père Lammens, they allege a bias of mind and a fierceness of partisanship, which, they hold, sours the judgment and beclouds scholarship. Upon this matter they may well take courage. It is a long time since a wise soul, whose very name is now almost forgotten, amid all the clash of crusading days, went East to convert the Mohammedan world, by sympathy and admiration and a rational proof that Christianity is better. And Western scholarship, upon the whole, has learned that lesson. Why should it do otherwise? What it desires is truth. And it were a poor thing to seek to belittle any of God's spokesmen, and so dim the splendour of humanity. Moreover, Christian scholars know that it is a niggardly tribute to Christ to feel that one must cheapen others to ensure His uniqueness. Rather is He so magnifical a Figure, that even when these others are depicted at their highest, He towers up among them—by Himself, alone. There is not much conscious bias among real authorities, and perhaps what is troubling our authors here is really that old difficulty Montefiori once summed up with such neat accuracy, that the true history of a religion can never be written, because those who acknowledge it are biased in its favour, while those outside it cannot know the secret of its power.

But our authors feel that things are being made more difficult than they need be, even by authorities like Casanova, to whose knowledge and fine temper they pay lavish tribute. Their minds recoil from the critical method, resent seeing their holy things teased and fingered, are of opinion that the aim is often not truth but mere novelty; that this itch to be original is a mental disease; are quite sure that the facts are far more likely to be found in the consistent Mohammedan tradition than in some alien's brilliant guesses. In short, they are feeling what all Christendom passed through some thirty years ago, and is still experiencing. Again let them take heart of grace. The Lord Christ remains as profound a Mystery as ever: nothing vital has been lost or even tarnished. And Mohammed, also, will not lose anything that is really his.

But there is truth in their central thesis. It is the old dilemma, 'East is east and West is west, and never the twain shall meet.' Or, as they put it in the motto of their essay, 'Assuredly, you are in one valley, and I am in another.' The Western mind to them seems almost incapacitated from understanding accurately any Eastern faith, and its interpretations of them are apt to be clumsy and crude and laughable. For it works differently; sees the world from an opposite angle, is the child of quite other philosophies. For one thing our passion for logic is unfamiliar to the Eastern peoples. They are not systematizers in our sense; can hold together in their brain without discomfort several doctrines mutually destructive in our view; argue boldly that the scheme of things is too big to be combined in a system wrought out by a human mind, without spilling over. All which is stated, almost finally, in a remarkable passage in one of his introductions by Gibb in his *Ottoman Poetry*, a passage quite uncanny in its insight. So here our authors tell us plaintively that in certain Western books upon their faith and its leading apostles they can find nothing that they recognize; nothing Eastern but the names, which are affixed to monstrosities, made to think as no Eastern ever did. Even Mohammed has a French or British accent! All which, they tell us, has the same bewildering effect on them we would experience if some Chinese scholar wrote on Richelieu or Napoleon, and tricked him out in the full mental equipment of a Chinaman—pigtail, so to speak, and all!

That is the central difficulty, which ought to compel us all to a becoming modesty. This little

[1] *L'Orient vu de l'Occident*, Essai critique par E. Douet et Sliman Ben Ibrahim (pp. 104. Geuthner: Paris). *Les Penseurs de L'Islam*, Baron Carra de Vaux (vol. i. pp. 383, and vol. ii. pp. 400. Geuthner: Paris). *Les Pauvres d'Israel*, A. Causse, Prof. à la Faculté de théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg (pp. 172. Librairie Istra; 8 francs). *La Théologie de St. Cyprian*, Prof. D'Alès, à l'Institut Catholique de Paris (pp. 432. Beauchesne: Paris; 24 francs). *La Liberté Chrétienne*, Robert Will (pp. 329. Librairie Istra; 14 francs).

book brings it back to the mind with vividness. And yet the authors never fail in that wise rule laid down in the Koran, 'Do not dispute on religion with the people of the Book (that is to say, with Jews and Christians) except with the most perfect courtesy.'

If we are ever to know one another, East and West, we must have the facts. And here, in *The Thinkers of Islam*, is a work such as we require. These are the first two volumes of what is ultimately to grow to five in all, and that, as the Preface remarks truly, is a mere selection, a bunch or two of flowers gathered out of an almost endless field stretching from Spain to China, from Mohammed to our day. Rulers, historians, political writers, and tales, are followed by geographers, mathematicians, and men of science. Behind them are to come a volume on Law and Mohammedanism, another on Philosophy, Theology, and Mysticism, and last one on the Sects and Modern Thought. In running through this programme, one is struck by the absence of poets, and that very forcibly in view of the enormous mass of Arabic and Turkish poetry, and the huge place it holds in Persian literature. But, evidently, they are to be brought in under other heads, and justifiably enough. Firdousi, *e.g.*, appears, legitimately, under the historians; and others will crowd in among the mystics and philosophers. The work begins at the circumference, and leaves the best till near the end. It is too soon for the great philosophers, for Attar's fascinating *Lives of the Saints*, for the Sufis, for Al Ghazzali and his autobiography—to be linked with Richard Baxter's *Self Review* as among the most honest books existing. All that is still to come. Yet even in these two initial volumes, what a bewildering pageant passes before the eyes, what splashes of colour, what mighty names, what a sense of sunlight and romance and witchery! Haroun-al-Raschid; Saladin, with the splendour of his chivalry; Tamerlane, with his Memoir, claiming, although with so much blood upon his hands, to be the most compassionate of men, who has won the love of all God's creatures! Akbar the tolerant and catholic-minded, for the term thinker is given a wide scope, and includes the makers of the Empire; Tabari, dry but accurate, for as a rule the Arab historian is a collector of facts and not a theorist; Mas'oudi, with his interest in the whole world; Makkari and his vivid pictures of Moslem Spain; Firdousi, ever popular with his own people, though wearisome to us; the glamour and spell of *The Thousand and One Nights*; adventurers like Sindbad the Sailor; Omar Khayyam, introduced, not for his quatrains, but as the author of the most famous work on Algebra; the long line of astronomers; Avicenna, with his Canon of Medicine, insisting like ourselves on games and breathing exercises; and Averroes, and dozens more. Strange figures flit across the stage—a German knight who, going East to fight for Christendom, becomes a Moslem, ends by being Sultan! Elizabeth of England, scared by news of the Armada, and begging for a Turkish fleet! But probably the most remarkable mind so far is Ibn Khaldoun, whose Prolegomena to his great history is certainly one of the most memorable books ever written. Here is a man who with his modernness, with his inquiry into how things happened, why states arose, how peoples are affected by their climate and a dozen other things, picking with unresting fingers at many of our present problems, worried by the crowding of folk into towns, watching how empires rise and die, seems born before his time, and in his outlook is our own contemporary. This is a useful book, and it will grow in interest as it proceeds.

Such a mass of achievement all born, in a sense, of some wild Arab tribes is staggering enough. And yet is it, after all, as wonderful as the story which Professor Causse depicts for us in *The Poor of Israel* with a swift rush that whirls us through the years? A nomadic people establish themselves in a land half conquered, settle down there as a race of peasants, with a kind of horror of culture and art, with a simple clan life, and a primitive family religion. By and by there come prosperity, kinship, a land flooded with foreign luxuries, a new ease and selfishness. Voices are raised in protest, in appeal to hold by the old simpler ways. But more and more religion becomes centralized in the new capital, and increasingly divorced from the people's daily life, though the prophets still plead and warn; and those who gathered the law together still point to the past as the ideal, or in Deuteronomy forward to a golden age which will reproduce and perfect it. In time, caught by great currents, the little state is dashed to pieces, blotted out, its folk a mere huddle of slaves lost in the hordes of mighty Babylon. But in their hopeless plight some of the captives dream great dreams, and croon songs to their own sore hearts, and clutch

at God there in the dark. And some adventurous spirits go straggling back, from time to time, to the old land, spurred by the vision of a greater, cleaner empire that they are to build. And it all ends—partly in nothing, and partly in a new priestly aristocracy with its new pomps and claims. But 'the poor' still dream their dreams, still cling to God, still feel a pride in their own poverty, are still sure God will justify them in the end, though nothing ever seems to come to prove it. What has it all to do with us, this queer obsession of those people long ago? Only that the voices raised to protest against their wrongs were the prophets who still thrill us like a trumpet blast, and still arrest us in God's name; that the songs they sang there in the darkness are the Psalms which haunt us; are, in parts, the most perfect of all expressions of our deepest feelings, our most intimate moods; that their impossible dreams came true, thank God, in our Lord Jesus Christ. But is there anywhere a stranger or a more unlikely tale than this amazing fragment of real history?

Will the perennial problem of authority and liberty ever be solved? Here are two books that raise it all again with vividness. Professor D'Alès has given us a scholarly and detailed study of *The Theology of Cyprian*, that dignified and lovable and sincerely religious figure, with his affection for Christ, and his enviable experience of how remarkably the faith works out in actual life and character. And this man, with such right to speak, lays it down that implicit obedience to the Church's authority and teaching is of the essence of salvation, carries matters the full length. When, irritated by his leniency towards those who had 'lapsed' under persecution and wished to be restored, certain sterner spirits broke away and founded a new Christian sect, he denounced them as worse than the lapsed; declared their Church to be no Church, their sacraments no sacraments, their sense of Christ's presence sheer delusion. They are outside the ark, and doomed. At all costs the unity of the Church must be maintained. There is, and can be, no Church, except one. And as one looks over the centuries, so full of party spirit, and dissensions, and energy immeasurable, that might have gone to the winning of the world, spent in internecine strife; and out across the earth, still largely outside of the kingdom, filled even yet with the old din and babble, have not his fears been justified; and was it not a gracious dream, his dream of unity which, in an ideal world, would surely have come true?

And yet here is Pasteur Will, with a work no less scholarly and thorough, on the religion of Luther, whose whole contendings were founded, line on line, on his own actual experiences of what God had done in him—and it is named, legitimately, *Christian Liberty*. For if for him the foundation was justification by faith, the structure built on it was freedom. And he too carried matters the full length, claimed this as a first necessity of any real salvation. In things political, indeed, he compromised, and counselled a submission there which, thinks our author, is responsible for the alienation of the German masses to-day from the Church. And in certain lines he gave back somewhat ere the end. But in the heyday of his power he would not compromise on this at all. Lose this, and all is lost. 'Pope,' he cries in one place, 'this is what you and your councils have decided. But I too have the right of judgment, and can ask myself, "But do I accept this your decision, or do I not?"' In later years the Anabaptists taunted him with having set up a new paper pope in his doctrine of the verbal Inspiration of Scripture, which has had dismal consequences for the Church. And yet he freely exercised, what he claimed as his right, to differentiate between the true and the outworn in Scripture. 'We will found on the authority of Christ against the Scriptures.' Well, who is to decide? Will it ever be settled, this old clash about the fundamentals? or must men just agree to differ? Will some spirits always find a peace and restfulness in passing from the difficulties of decision into the blind acceptance of what the Church's authority lays down for them—the kind of peace many felt in the army—to be a part of a great machine—not theirs to think or plan, but simply to wait and obey? Will others always find that quite impossible; insist on coming to God for themselves, on their own feet, to look at Him with their own eyes, to think it out with their own minds, to have it at first hand? As Fraser of Brea found no peace until he learned that each man is an original, and need not, cannot indeed, reproduce any other man's experience. There are twelve gates into the holy city, says that wise dream of a catholic mind, and some face east, some west, some north, some south; and people, travelling in exactly opposite directions, reach the same goal at last.

Aberdeen. ARTHUR J. GOSSIP.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How to get Full Marks.

'Having your conversation honest.'—1 P 2^{12}.

That big word 'conversation' makes you think of when Mother has friends in of an afternoon; and there's a buzz of talk all round the room, as if a swarm of bees had settled down in it. But it doesn't mean that here. Somebody once translated this verse 'Do things bonnily,' and that is right, for it's your old friend of the Greek grammar, καλός, καλή, καλόν. 'Do things bonnily'; let us think of that.

When you're at your lessons, there are two points needed, if you are to do them really well—the thing must be done right, and it must be done neatly. And both are required; one of them alone is not enough.

Perhaps you're at a Maths paper; and perhaps you are a neat-handed little lass. And so the figures are made daintily, and the lines are beautifully straight, and there is not a blot or a correction anywhere. And, when you give it in, the examiner, glancing at it as he lays it on the pile of papers, says to himself, 'Ah! this is splendid!' But if the answers are all wrong, he can't give many marks. It's neat, but it's not right; and it must be both.

Or, the other night you were out playing, and the time ran on before you knew, and it grew late, and there was all your work to do—an exercise, for one thing, Latin, or Greek, or French. And you did it absolutely right, without one single slip. But, when you came in, your hands were hot and soiled, and you didn't wait to wash, just sat down as you were. And in the hurry you made blots here and there, and rubbed out so hard you tore through the paper, or when you were blotting it some one nudged you and the thing got smudged. And when your teacher saw it, 'What's this?' he said; 'certainly it's right, not one mistake in it, but it's so untidy! If you ever give me such an exercise again, I'll make you write it out ten times.' It was right, but it wasn't bonnie; and it must be both.

And that is so with the biggest lesson of all. People forget their French, or let slip lots of things, and yet manage along fairly well. But there's one lesson we must never forget, but always be getting better and better at it, the hardest of all lessons—living. And if we want to get full marks there, we must do it right, and we must do it bonnily.

You know what I mean. When they were down in the Antarctic, and the food was running out, and their strength was giving, you remember how one of them whose feet had gone bad so that he could hardly walk, and was keeping back the rest, got up one day and said quietly, 'I'm going outside, I may be away some time'; and went into the storm where the blizzard would freeze him to death in a very little while. And the others looked at each other, for they knew what he meant, knew he was throwing away his own life to give them a chance to live. That was a fine thing which thrills us. It was done so bonnily. He gave away his life with no fuss, as if he were handing a copper to a beggar.

Or, when Admiral Duncan, the great Scottish sailor, was cut off by the enemy, and thought there was no chance of escape, he sounded till he came to a shallow place, and nailed his colours to the mast-head, and 'we'll make a fight of it,' said he, 'for when we and the ship are all under the water, the flag will be fluttering above us still.' And that moves us yet. It's not enough to do the right thing, we must do it bonnily.

Now, you remember that. There's that old, old trouble about going to bed. You sit as still as a mouse, and the time runs on, but at last Mother notices you, and then the thing begins. You plead, you wheedle, you argue; when that won't do any longer you get on Mother's knee (that is good for ten minutes usually), and then you say good-night, and that spins out to another five. And it goes on and on, till at last father looks up and growls out, 'Send that boy to bed at once, and be done with it.' And you have to go. You do it, but not bonnily. But when there is a horrid thing to face, we mustn't only do it, we must do it bonnily. When the *Birkenhead* went down, and the glorious order rang out, 'Women and children to the boats!' the troops lined up and went down in their ranks, watching the sharks that were waiting for them. That gives us a thrill. It was the right thing done, and it was done so well.

Or you are sent a message, and you have to go; but your face is sulky, and your feet drag, and you

are cross and peevish over it. Yet the other month when the *Egypt* sank there was a printer on board, and he had put a lifebelt on, was waiting for the plunge, when a woman rushed past him in a panic, and back again, searching desperately for a belt. And with that he took off his, and handed it to her. 'Madam,' he said, 'this is yours!' And she was saved, but he was drowned. There is something glorious in that. He didn't only do the right thing, he did it so splendidly. Suppose one of the crew without a belt had come to him, and said, 'Look here, there is a woman over yonder with no lifebelt.' And suppose he had answered, 'Well, what about it? My life is as much to me as hers can be to her.' And suppose the sailor had replied, 'Oh, but she's a woman! Play the game.' And suppose he had said, 'Well, there's something in that,' and had taken off his belt, and handed it to her with the words, 'There you are; but, mind you, this is pretty hard on me.' Even so, he would have done a noble thing, have died for a stranger. But he did it so bonnily, threw away his life as easily as if he were offering her his seat in a tramcar, didn't wait to be asked. 'Madam, this is yours!' And that was all. That is the way to get full marks, to do the right thing and to do it in a beautiful way.

And nobody can teach us how to learn to do that like Jesus Christ, who always did the right thing and so bonnily. A man dashed in with a story of a sick servant, and before he had well begun, Christ was on His feet. I will go and heal him, He said, offering eagerly, not waiting to be asked. And on the Cross He didn't whine and struggle and hate His enemies, or just bear what had to be borne. 'Father, forgive them,' He said, 'for they know not what they do'—doing it grandly. Live near Him, watch Him, imitate Him, and He will show you how life should be lived, and then God looking at yours will eagerly give you full marks, because it will be both right and bonnie.

Stick it!

'Never despairing.'—Lk 6^{35} (R.V.).

You all know, don't you, what 'perseverance' means? It's to stick in when it seems no use; it's to keep trying over and over and over again; it's to play your hardest till the whistle blows although three goals down; it's not to get put off your game when hit for a couple of sixes, but to say to yourself, 'Well, we'll send down another kind of ball this time'; and when you've tried your home sum three times, and been wrong, to take a new bit of paper and sit down and do it all over again; it's to be plucky and keep at it.

That is what made Britain. We aren't a very clever people, so folk say. But we can hold on. In all our wars we begin badly, but we can take punishment and stick it, and in the end that wins. In the Great War we had a very bad time till we got going, and the armies were ready. But the boys at the front just set their teeth and stuck it out, and that pulled us through. 'Ours are the bravest soldiers in the world,' said a famous Frenchman; and a famous Englishman made answer, 'Well, I can't say that of ours: others are just as brave, but ours keep brave a quarter of an hour longer.' It's that last quarter of an hour that makes the difference. If you want to be a real Briton you must never despair, but stick in when things look all black and difficult and horrid.

And if you want to be a Christian, that is still more true. Never give in, says Christ, never lose heart, never admit that you are beaten. Up again! up again! You've been hammered, and battered, and down time after time; but the fight isn't over till the sponge and towel are thrown in. Up again, and try once more. And this time you may manage it. That's difficult, isn't it? We try something, really hard; to bite our lips and hold back ugly, passionate words, and they slip through before we know; to do what we know we should do, and each time we forget; to keep from being selfish and tempery and ill-natured, and we can't. And by and by we say, 'Ah well, it can't be helped,' and just give in, and stop; pull up the stumps halfway through the innings and won't play on because our best wickets are down for next to nothing; troop off the field because the other side has scored a goal. 'No, no,' says Christ, 'that will never do. No real boy would act like that.' A Christian is one who can stick it when it's hard, and there's not much to encourage one. Perhaps last session you did poorly, and got bad reports and you lost heart. Well, try again this session. Perhaps your temper is a constant bother; it catches upon any little thing; it blazes up over nothing at all. And you have often meant to put it right, and tried, but nothing came of it. Begin again, says Christ. There's a goal against you. But here's a new kick-off. All on! and after the ball!

and you may score this time, if you play hard, and don't stop trying.

Did you ever watch salmon leaping? It's a fine sight. They are going up the river from the sea, and come to a high fall, and what are they to do? They leap at it—a wonderful leap that would make the boy who won the high jump at your school sports look foolish. It's done it! No! It has fallen right into the heart of the boiling water, where it roars and tumbles over, and is swept down again. See! It tries again, and again, and again, a full dozen times. Ah, it's growing tired, that was a very short one. But it doesn't give in. It lies and waits, until it has recovered, and then at it once more. It never gives in till, sooner or later, at the first or at the twentieth time, it leaps right over, and so away up the river. And are you going to be beaten by a little creature like a salmon? Has it got more pluck and grit than you? A Christian, says Christ, is a boy or girl who won't surrender, sees what is right, and struggles to it till he reaches it; keeps trying, picking himself up after each fall and trying once again all in good temper and with a big heart that won't give in, till at long last he manages it, and the thing is done.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Advent.

Fear.

'Through fear of death.'—He 2^{15}.

A threefold fear oppressed the world, into which Christ entered, with His gospel of overcoming love—a fear of demons, of death, and of fate. These were regarded as powers, non-human and inhuman, recking nothing of man's need or longing, deaf to his entreaties, unmoved by his tears. Such divine beings as men believed in could do little to help their votaries, whose most zealous, or most expensive devotions, left them still a prey to unrelieved terror. Through faith in Jesus, the Son of the Father's love, a way was opened out of all this gloom into a realm where God is supreme and no powers can compete with the supremacy of love (Col 1^{13}). Redeeming love has invaded their citadel, and broken the bars of their fortress, and liberated their captives. Now there is nothing, up or down, in the wide world, which can withstand Love's omnipotence. This explains both the pains and the impatience with which New Testament writers combat the worship of angels, and repel any idea of invading by other mediators the sole sufficiency of Jesus. Jesus saves—He absolutely and He only; and nothing can withstand Him!

(1) Not *demons*: Jews and Gentiles alike believed in malignant beings, who occupied the environment of human life, and could plague and even destroy their victims. Whether beings, such as the men of these days believed in, really exist, has been much debated. Converts from non-Christian religions frequently have maintained that they do; and such Christians have gloried in the defeat of demons by the Name of Jesus in a manner that recalls the exultation of the New Testament. There is no debate as to the phenomena. The only question is as to what they portend. Do they demand as their explanation the existence of malignant forces? Or are they sufficiently accounted for by phases of our own sinful self, such as may be disclosed by hypnotic treatment? The answer does not affect the beneficent fact of Love's overcoming power. Whatever forces of evil rage in our environment, and assail our sin-weakened wills, they are impotent to harm a soul that has taken refuge with Christ. This does not mean that there will be no manifestation of these enemies of our life. But it does mean that deliverance from their worst assaults is certified to faith; and it does open a new avenue for the duty and the power of intercessory prayer.

(2) Not *death*: wherever death is brought within the scope of the moral judgment, it cannot be other than terrible, when that judgment is heavy with the guilt of unforgiven sin. Where there is no knowledge of God in His love, death must be a hated foe, or, at best, the anodyne of an eternal sleep. Against it, life and love enter their passionate and unavailing protest. Yet this enemy, too, Jesus traced to its stronghold, the grave, and wrested from it its prey, the human spirit. By dying, He vanquished the power of death, and released from thraldom those who lay under a lifelong fear of death. Death is one of the 'all things' that belong to us, inasmuch as we belong to Christ, as He does to God (1 Co 3^{22}). It is to be anticipated with solemnity and deep awe of soul, as a great and wonderful event in which Love and Faith meet together, and triumph in the last earthly conflict with sin. The catacomb inscriptions at Rome have often been cited as containing imperishable witness to the wide con-

trast between the pagan and the Christian attitude toward death. That contrast must always exist, according as the human conscience does or does not acknowledge the victory of love over sin and the grave. A world with the dust of a dead Christ blown across its surface would be still under the dominion of sin, and the terror of dying. A world which beholds Christ's empty grave is under the dominion of redeeming love; and, through the shadows of sorrow, and pain, and dying, faith's uplifted face meets and reflects the radiance of ever-living Love. How far does the Great Salvation extend? As far as the distance that separates the grave from the Throne, where the conquerors sit with the conquering Lord, as He with His Father.

(3) Not *fate*: this is the ultimate shadow that sin casts upon the human spirit. The sunny Greek temperament felt it like a chill at the heart of its joy of living. The very gods of Hellas owned its power. Modern thought conceives it differently; but, in essence, it is the inevitable counterpart of ignorance of Divine Love. It means that the goal of the world's history is determined by a power, or principle, or tendency, to which the needs and aspirations of the human spirit are irrelevant. A man may make a fight against fate, or he may ignore it in the engrossing occupations of business or pleasure. But it remains always his master; and ultimately he sinks beneath its despotism. To a world in the grip of a great despair the Gospel of Love makes known a God who has achieved His redeeming purpose in Christ, and is pledged to carry it forward through time to eternity. Salvation does not overleap time and leave neglected the intense interests, the keen anxieties, the deep sorrows, which belong to our earthly career. It is a false spirituality which ignores the common needs of every day, and treats common providences as a mere appendix of God's grace. God's providence is part of His gracious dealing with our souls. It is to be well observed what faith in providence really is, and what it carries with it. It is faith in the God who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all; and it warrants the conviction that He will surely give us everything besides (Ro 8^{32}). In that 'everything' is comprehended all that is needed to bring our Salvation to its perfection. Our faith in providence, accordingly, is far other than a pretentious Theodicy, presuming to prove by intellectual demonstration that this is the best of all possible worlds. Faith's affirmation is that God is Love. Its proof is the atoning Cross. Its inference is 'that those who love God, those who have been called, in terms of His purpose, have His aid and interest in everything' (Ro 8^{28}). Therefore faith faces the darkest, most heart-shaking mysteries of earth, not with a theory which claims to solve all problems, but with an experience which underlies and overreaches the whole of human life.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

A Time of Joy.

'That your joy might be full.'—Jn 15^{11}.

As the fourth Sunday is the last in the course of the preparation, and nearest to the actual Advent, it sets forth the state of mind which such expectation is calculated to produce. It might be supposed that the looking forward to the coming of the Lord would create great mental depression, a fearful foreboding, an utter extinction of joyousness from the life of men. The contrary is the truth. The note of the fourth Sunday is joy. The angel who appeared to the shepherds to announce the birth of Christ spoke of it as a joyful event. 'Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy.' Immediately after the Annunciation Mary visited her cousin Elizabeth, and in her Magnificat she said, 'My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour!' Our Lord often spoke to the Apostles of the joy of the Sacred Heart; He calls it 'My joy.' After the Resurrection the disciples 'believed not for joy'; and after the Ascension, in spite of all their suffering, they were filled 'with great joy.' Indeed, this holy joy is mentioned far too often in the Epistles to make it possible to quote the instances. St. Paul's own hope for himself is that even in martyrdom he may finish his 'course with joy,' and endure all things even as the Master, who 'for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame.' The Apostles had ever in mind the Divine Master's promise, 'Your sorrow shall be turned into joy,' and 'your joy no man taketh from you.'

1. *What is joy?* Happiness, pleasure, and joy are commonly used as if they were synonymous, but they really refer to conditions essentially distinct. Pleasure comes from the senses, and happiness from our surroundings, *i.e.* from our 'hap' or lot in life. But 'joy,' literally, denotes a leap or spring, as does the Latin word 'exult,' which means

a leaping forth. Coleridge, addressing a noble Christian lady, sings:

O pure of heart! Thou needst not ask of me
What this strong music of the soul may be!
What, and wherein it doth exist—
This light, this glory, this fair luminous mist,
This beautiful, and beauty-making power
Joy, virtuous lady! Joy that ne'er was given
Save to the pure, and in their purest hour—
Life and life's effluence, cloud at once and shower;
Joy, lady, is the spirit and the power
That wedding nature gives to us in dower,
A new earth and new heaven
We in ourselves rejoice!

The joy that is a fruit of the spirit arises from the deep secrets of spiritual satisfaction. It is the sense of health and wholesomeness when the soul lives and breathes in its native air. It is fellowship with the eternal springs. It is the assurance of all-rightness in our relations with the eternal God. One gropes for all sorts of analogies to express the wealthy fact. It is the joy of the wedded union between the soul and the Lord. It is the interpassage of covenanted love. It is the interchange of sacred confidences. The soul has come to herself, and she has found herself in God, and all her springs are in Him! 'Have you water all the year round?' I said to a friend who had built a house in a somewhat droughty place. 'Yes,' he answered, 'our wells are very deep!'

2. Christian joy is *a joy of very startling independencies*. It is perfectly amazing what this joy can do without, and yet keep on burning. It can do without material treasure. It can do without friendly circumstances. We find it shining in the association of persecution and pain. The New Testament writers appear to love to startle us with the shock of a great surprise. We turn to its pages, and we are reading some black record of hostility to the Christian faith, a record of inconceivable suffering, and just when our spirit is sinking before the almost certain despondency and despair of the followers of Christ, we are aroused by the shining wonder of a strong joy. 'The disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost.' 'And they departed from the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer for Christ.'

3. *Joy is vital*. It ministers to bodily, mental, and spiritual health and strength. We cannot overestimate the value of joy in the religious life, even in its most hard and strenuous hours. Temptation is best encountered, not with a light heart, as if there were no fear, but with a heart glad in the assurance of God's help. A flow of happy feeling braces men for effort.[1]

President H. Churchill King says: 'Joy directly increases our vitality. Greater vitality gives greater sense of reality. This means stronger convictions. Of convictions, purposes are born. And conviction and purpose make influence certain. The spiritual life may not safely ignore these facts.'

4. *The secret of joy*. Here is the secret—(1) 'Abide in me, and my joy shall abide in you.' It is the joy of a deeply intimate communion with Christ. The deeper intimacy gives a larger freedom, and it is the larger freedom that gives birth to joy and song. And how do we get this deeper communion? How do we pass into the inner rooms of the love of our Lord? We do it just by giving Him entry into the inner rooms in our own souls. We get no deeper into Christ than we allow Him to get into us. Indeed, what we really mean by getting into Christ is permitting Him to get into us. Our intimacy with Christ is just in proportion to the surrender of ourselves to Him. If I would deepen my intimacy with Christ, the way to do it is to open another room.

(2) And the second secret of spiritual joy is this: the joy wells up within us in ever-deepening copiousness as we co-operate with our Lord in the service of His Kingdom. 'Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost.' But would all the neighbours be able to rejoice with Him in equal measure? Suppose one neighbour had been out with Him on the wilds, and shared in the perils and mishaps of the search, would he not be the one who would enter most deeply into the joy of the finding? That is the principle: they who have shared in the toils of the quest will share in the joys of the conquest. 'Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'[2]

First Sunday after Christmas.

Immanuel.

'And they shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us.'—Mt 1^{23}.

Matthew is quoting from the prophet Isaiah. The circumstance and conditions of the prophecy

[1] G. Steven, *The Warp and the Woof*.
[2] J. H. Jowett, *The Friend on the Road*.

were roughly as follows: Ahaz was afraid of the confederacy of Ephraim and Syria, and despite his timidity in asking a sign which should be a token of their overthrow, Isaiah offers him a sign; a young woman shall conceive and bare a son, and shall call His name Immanuel, and this child shall live to see extraordinary political developments, in which the confederate nations shall disappear. The almost immediate fulfilment of this prophecy is, of course, the only thing that would be a sign to Ahaz. It means, briefly, that by the birth of a child now about to be conceived the conditions shall so have altered that the mother shall call her child Immanuel, God with us.

Was there no Messianic experience, then, in the mind of the prophet? Did Isaiah mean nothing further than that a certain child about to be born would be called 'Immanuel' by his mother in token of her faith that God was still with Israel. It may well be that Isaiah expected not only a child to be born with this name, but that the Messiah would appear in the person of the little son of one of the royal wives.

So far as we know, Isaiah's prophecy, even if understood without a Messianic reference, was not literally fulfilled. There is no trace of any child being called Immanuel. If the prophecy was Messianic, referring, perhaps, to one of the king's sons—probably Hezekiah—it was also unfulfilled. The name was too big for Hezekiah. He did not answer to it.

But here comes in the remarkable fact, that though, in its primary application, the prophecy was falsified by the event, and Isaiah lived to see it falsified, he left it standing in the book of his prophecies. The meaning of this is surely that, though mistaken in his choice of the person in whom the hope was to be fulfilled, the hope itself was no treacherous or delusive one. Some day, Isaiah knew, the great and glorious Person would appear in whom men would feel that God had in very truth come to dwell in the midst of them, and who would fittingly answer to this majestic name—Immanuel, God with us. So he left the prophecy standing, and it became the great and inspiring hope of Israel. Centuries passed, and one and another great man appeared, but none of them answered to the name. Josiah, Nehemiah, Judas Maccabæus—the name was too big for them all. And then Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary, in Bethlehem of Judah, and Matthew, thinking of the life which had so humble and insignificant a beginning, finds the great and glowing anticipation of the prophet at last fulfilled. There had at length appeared in the world one who answered to this majestic name—Immanuel.

So candid and open souls—like Nathanael and the writer of this Gospel—greeted Him as the promised Saviour, the King of Israel, because in Him was fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophet, saying: 'Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us.' This great faith about Christ was born of their experience of Him. Jesus made the men and women about Him feel He was Immanuel by the words He spoke and the deeds He did. He produced the sense of God within them; He did the works of God upon them. It was because they had found God in Him that they were sure and certain that Isaiah's great word found its fulfilment and satisfaction in Jesus.

What does this glorious and majestic name of Immanuel mean as applied to Christ? It means that Christ was unique. He was a prophet—but He was also much more than a prophet. He was the comrade of men—but He was also much more than their comrade; He was their Master and Lord. He was an enthusiast; the zeal of God's house consumed Him—but He was much more than an enthusiast; He was the mighty quickener of earnestness and zeal. He was men's friend and brother—but He was also infinitely more; He was their King and their God. When we attempt to whittle away the uniqueness of Christ and to empty Him of His dignities, we are not getting 'back to Christ'; we are getting away from Him. To those who stood nearest to Him He was no mere man. Spite of His humble home and His seamless dress, His glory flashed and blazed before their eyes. They heap up dignities and honours upon Him; they add title to title. And at the finish all the dignities and honours and titles they give Him leave His essential glory undescried. For this Jesus to them was more than man: He was God manifest in the flesh, 'Immanuel, God with us.'

Remember Browning's triumphant confession:

> I say the acknowledgment of God in Christ,
> Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
> All question in the earth and out of it.

If Jesus be really Immanuel, God with us, what mighty truths does the fact proclaim?

1. The first truth it proclaims is that God has appeared in human life, that in Christ *God became a man*. Staggering and stupendous though the Incarnation is, it is not an incredible thing, but a supremely rational and natural thing. If God is a Personal Being, it is natural that He should reveal Himself. As Dr. Illingworth says: 'We cannot conceive a Person freely creating persons, except with a view to hold intercourse with them when created.' I do not and cannot believe in a deaf and dumb God. I believe in a God who can and who will hold intercourse with the creatures He has made. The naturalness of the Incarnation comes from the nature of God Himself. It comes also from the nature of man. Man is *capax Dei*. He has a capacity for God. He is a moral and spiritual being. This at once makes Incarnation possible and likely.

It is possible because the kinship between God and man is deeper and more vital than the difference. God breathed into man the breath of life, and he became a living soul. In the image of God created He him. God is Spirit, and man is spirit too. It follows from all this that if God must reveal Himself, it is in and through man He must do it, for only in man can He do it adequately or fully. He can show His power in the material universe, His wisdom on the field of history; but to show His love, His self-sacrificing and redeeming love which is His essential nature, He had to reveal Himself in the person of man. Man's nature makes it possible for Him to do so.

Man's nature makes the Incarnation not only possible but likely. For human nature is not only *capable of God*, it is also *eager and athirst* for God. 'Thou hast made us for Thyself,' said Augustine. Wherever you see man, you see him groping after God, if haply he may feel after Him and find Him. These instincts, we believe, are prophetic of their own fulfilment. God does not invest a man with useless powers. He does not mock him by planting within him instincts impossible of fulfilment. If He gives men this instinct for God, it is because there is a God to be seen and known. It was not Isaiah's great prophecy only that was fulfilled, but the anticipation and passion and desire of a world were satisfied when, in Jesus, God became 'Immanuel, God with us.'

2. Because God in Christ has become Immanuel. He is now *a God to be known*. This is not to say, of course, that men had no knowledge of God before Christ came. Men could not gaze at the works of God without being reminded of His power and Godhead. The world inevitably suggested the thought of a Creator. But you can never learn a person's *character* from the works of his hands. A watch may tell you that there must be a watchmaker, and that the watchmaker is possessed of great cleverness and skill, but the watch can give you no inkling of the nature of its master's temper and spirit. The fact is, the real secrets of personality can never be disclosed by means of *things*. Personality can only express itself through personality. You have only to read the Bible to discover how inadequate and how mistaken men's notions of God were before Christ came. You have only to think of foreign lands to know how inadequate and mistaken men's notions of God are to this day where Christ is not known. In Christ God has made Himself known. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

3. *God as Redeemer*. A verse or two before the text Matthew tells the story of the angel's announcement of Christ's forthcoming birth. He told Joseph what the child's name was to be. 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus,' he said, 'for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.' And then the Evangelist goes on straightway to say that all this was the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy that a virgin should bear a son, whose name should be called Immanuel. That is to say, according to the Evangelist, the birth of a Saviour was the coming of Immanuel. God, in order to become a saving God, had to become 'God with us.' He had to share our lot. For sin cannot be blotted out with a stroke of the pen. Its pain and curse can be removed only by being endured. And that is why God in Christ took flesh. That is why He lived our life, and faced our temptations, and bore our sins, and carried our sorrows, and died our death. He did it all that He might become a Redeemer. God in Christ has become God with us to rescue and redeem us.

4. God is with us again, not simply to rescue us from our sins: He is with us as our *Friend and Helper every day*. You have noticed how men and women in the Gospel story grew strong and brave in the presence of Christ. The unstable Peter grew steadfast, the miserly Zacchæus grew generous, the defiled and polluted Mary grew holy, when Christ

was nigh. Somehow or other, He helped them to be their best. And Christ is still the same. In Him, God is our Friend and Helper.

He is Immanuel, *God with us*. Here on earth we touch His hand, we see His face, we hear His voice. 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' You remember the old story that in the fiery furnace into which the three young men were cast there was seen to be One with them like unto the Son of God; and when they drew them up they found the flames had not kindled upon them, and they had come out of the fiery furnace unscathed? The old story is a parable of universal experience. In our fierce trials we too find we are not alone.

'God with us!'—the news has transfigured the world. Fear and dread have gone; and hope and joy have taken their place with us. And yet, to know the fulness of the joy of the gospel of the Incarnation, we must individualize that announcement. He must be, God with *me*.'[1]

First Sunday after Epiphany.

Follow the Gleam.

'Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.'—Mt 2[2].

This visit of the magi, the worshippers of Mithra, who came to lay their gifts at the feet of Christ may have mythical elements in it, but it need not be wholly legend. The question is a vexed and difficult one—whether historical or not, the story is full of meaning; it is at least a part of the homage of the imagination of the Early Church to the memory of her Lord. He was the fulfilment of all the hopes that clustered round the thoughts of the coming Deliverer. In the heart-throbs of the mother, in the spiritual outlook of the devout souls who waited in the Temple, or fed their sheep on the hill-slopes, in the strivings for an unknown ideal among the wise and reverent of all nations, there was a great and glorious expectancy, and He it was who satisfied all, and surpassed all, these yearnings of the spirits of men.

These wise men from the East rose and followed the star. This vision of the star is the message of Epiphany. It tells us that Christianity has in it the essential note of all romance. There is a light which flashes and is gone, and yet survives. There is a light which eludes, but never deceives. There is a light which guides as it flies. There is a light which comes only to those who seek in the night, and can feel after what they cannot find, and can still nurse 'the unconquerable hope,' and can never lose heart. There is a light which is for ever in motion, and can be retained only by moving with it. There is a light which is always just ahead of where you stand. You must follow if you would arrive; and the following must never cease. 'Up, and follow the gleam!' So the Spirit cries. Lo! the star still goes before you.

1. Every man has his star. Jesus had His star. You have your star. I have my star. Something grows upon us like a point of light out of the Unseen. Our life is not all earth-bound. Its centre is beyond the starry systems of the sky. God's thought and purpose for you and me is our star; our ideal destiny is our star; anything in us that recognizes a heavenly influence, that acknowledges a celestial destiny, that links us with the power and grace of our Maker and Redeemer, is our star. Our star is the symbol that for each of us there is heavenly work to do on earth and a heavenly crown to gain when earth's journeyings are done. Those star-led men wending their way to the cradle of the Infant Christ stand for the men and women who see visions and dream dreams, but who are not content with seeing and dreaming but take toilsome journeys and fulfil lowly tasks on their way to realizing their dreams.

2. The star stands for all the gracious illusions of life which lead us to our true realities. God has that way with men. He does not plant us face to face with life's ultimate realities at the start. He lures us on; He sets guiding lights in our sky. How the path to knowledge has been beset by illusions! Century by century the thirst for scientific truth has been tormenting the hearts of the wise and the teachable, and their way, so far, has been from one illusion to another, and even to-day the wisest of all wise men will tell you that their knowledge of the great cosmos may be only a larger illusion. Does that make them give up the quest? Some, indeed, give it up, and cry, with mocking Pilate, 'What is truth?' Others halt doubtingly, and become scientific sceptics. But still the star leads on, breaking now and again through scattering clouds and over storm-swept seas; and still the chosen spirits follow its lead, feeling sure that each headland takes them nearer to port, and that every discarded system and

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 154.

explanation is a step towards God's ultimate truth. And what illusions have beset the path of religion! Abraham saw Christ's star, and was 'glad.' We can see it shining in the sky of the 'Old Dispensation' from point to point, and moving across the centuries through the troubled hours of that long night of waiting which beset the people of God. Lawgiver and prophet, psalmist and seer, saw that star, and followed it on and on till they fell exhausted, but with their faces towards the light. 'These all died, not having received the promises; but having seen them and greeted them from afar.'

3. God's stars always lead us to our goal. God leads us, it is true, through illusions and from one illusion to another, but not that He may land us in final confusion. If we follow the gleam long enough, and far enough, we shall come to the Grail at last.

Let us arise and follow our star! It will lead us into strange places, perhaps; over many a craggy height, down into many a deep and shadowed valley, through many a haunted forest; but it will ever be on towards the goal of our desire, towards the divine fulfilments of our life. Perhaps, having followed it far, we may for a time miss the star, because we have wandered out of its way, as did the wise men when they turned towards Jerusalem. But as they once more saw the star, when they turned towards Bethlehem, and rejoiced with exceeding great joy, so we shall recover the power of vision when we tread the lowly path of duty.[1] How blessed if, in His strength, not our own, we can say at the end: 'I have seen His star, and by His great mercy I am come to worship Him.'

[1] E. Griffith-Jones in *C.W.P.* xcviii. 304.

Contributions and Comments.

The Sacrifice of Isaac.

The Divine command to the Patriarch Abraham to offer his son Isaac as a burnt offering (Gn 22) is generally regarded as a testing or proving of the faith of the Father of the faithful in One God. 'Now I know that thou fearest God,' is conclusive on that head. The difficulty connected with the event lies in the unwillingness to believe that the Almighty could for any purpose command His servant to act in a way which contradicts all that we hold as to the love of God for His children. Human sacrifice was common in the days of Abraham, and the offering of the eldest son was felt to be the highest proof that men could give of their devotion to Deity. Was this feeling the outcome simply of human minds pondering on sacrificial values? Or, was it a putting into practice some innate instinct, the realization of an idea latent in the humanity which we are told was created in the image of God? If man is God's image, if all that belongs to the truth of his being has its counterpart in the being of God, then the idea of the sacrifice of the best must be of Divine origin, and the perversion (if it was a perversion) connected with it which took the form of offering children must be attributed to the sinful condition which ensued the Fall. But was it altogether a perversion? Was it not rather an anticipation of the great sacrifice when God Himself 'gave his only-begotten Son' to die for our redemption? Looked at in this way, the command to offer Isaac becomes part of the method by which God taught men by symbols the eternal realities concerning Himself. God and His methods being what they are, such a command was a necessary incident in the long process of teaching the world through prophets who have always been the exponents of the Divine will.

If the command to offer Isaac was a foreshadowing of a greater offering to come (albeit already in the Divine Mind) the circumstances of the lesser offering should have some symbolical relation to the greater. We find these in the expressions used in the command. The Voice said: 'Thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest.' At the Baptism of our Lord the same Voice proclaimed: 'This is my Son, my beloved' (St. Matthew); 'Thou art my beloved Son' (St. Mark); 'Thou art my beloved Son' (St. Luke). The descent of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism led St. John to say: 'I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God,' with the subsequent declaration that He of whom he bore witness was 'the Lamb of God,' that is, the sacrifice ordained for the redemption of man.

When the Lord manifested His glory on the Mount, the same Voice declared: 'This is my beloved Son' (St. Matthew and St. Mark). St. Luke, in recording the same event, tells us that the conversation between the Lord and the two witnesses from the Old Testament was concerning His 'exodus,' that is, His sacrificial death, and again the Voice: 'This is my beloved Son, my chosen.' St. John the Evangelist, in connexion with his mention of the Baptist's witness, refers to our Lord as 'God only begotten.' The verbal parallel between the description of the son of Abraham and the Son of God is complete.

Abraham himself has generally been regarded as the O.T. type of the Father, not only from his having, in will at least, offered his son Isaac, but from his whole relation to the believers in One God to the end of time.

Whether 'one of the mountains' of Moriah was or was not the scene of the Great Sacrificial Consummation is uncertain, but wholly probable and in harmony with the setting of the symbolic rite. The relation between the son of Abraham bearing the wood of the offering and the Son of God traversing the Via Dolorosa with the burden of the wood of the Sacrifice has been seen by all. So, with the words of the patriarch, 'God will himself provide the lamb.' Abraham built an altar there, and it is important that the law which commanded altars to be built of unhewn stone or earth should be remembered, since stone, or rock, is the emblem of Deity. The phrase 'the altar of the cross' is only valid if it means the altar on which the wood, the cross, was raised. The cross was not the altar but the wood on which the victim was laid. This point is necessary if we are to preserve the truth that the Great Sacrifice was wholly a Divine action begun eternally in heaven, consummated on earth; that the Offerer and the Offered alike were Divine. Through forgetfulness of this truth has come the bewildering idea of the Sacrifice being an appeasement of the Father's wrath by a self-immolating Son and all the miserable controversies that have darkened counsel in past ages. In the symbolic action by Abraham, though real enough to him at the time, the crucial point was that Isaac was the child of promise. Through this son were all the promises of blessing to be fulfilled in the world; were he to die how could the promise be fulfilled at all? This was the climax of the test, and the strain on Abraham's faith must have been more than we can imagine. Thus it was that God revealed that the Victim of the Great Sacrifice was One who, in his own nature as God, could not die. As Isaac, simply in his human nature, could die, but, as the child of promise, must not die if the promise was to avail, so with the Eternal Son. As God He could not die, yet a death there must be. When the Patriarch saw the ram caught in the thicket, a victim whose death would avail the purpose of the Divine Mind, he saw the truth of the Incarnation. The Son of God could not die, but He could and did fulfil the Divine will by taking to Himself a nature in which death was possible. The parallel therefore is as complete as any parallel which has to be worked out in terms of temporality can be. And regarded in this light the sacrifice of Abraham and Isaac stands alone in the whole history of mankind as a portrayal of that One Offering in which God gave Himself to man through His Son, and provided for man a means by which he can approach and give himself to the Highest. The word 'substitution' has been the centre of any amount of acrimonious controversy through some centuries; much of it would have been avoided had the story of Isaac been more closely studied. It tells of 'substitution' indeed, since Abraham offered the ram 'in the stead of his son'; the animal which God 'provided' was to submit to death, else the prefigurement would not be complete. In the Great Sacrifice there was death indeed, its foretoken must therefore include death in some way. But to regard Christ as our 'substitute' in the sense that He died in our stead and hereby released us from any dying is to misread the earlier event. Christ in His human nature died for us, not to save us from death but from the sin which ensures eternal death. Yet we have to taste of death by mortifying our animal natures so that sin may be killed in us. The ram on Moriah answers to the debased sensual nature which must die if the higher spiritual nature is to be released. If, instead of speaking of our Lord as our 'substitute,' we regarded Him as The Way by which we can identify ourselves with Him in His sacrificial life, we shall be saved from the exaggeration which speaks of 'doing' as a 'deadly thing,' since Christ has done all, and give our attention to that Power which He supplies, 'provides,' that there may be a real death of sin within us. Identified with Him in sacrifice we shall also ensure our rising with Him, here and hereafter. But if we regard Him as our substitute in death we

must also see Him as our substitute in resurrection' a logical conclusion which of itself demonstrates the illogical use of the word substitution.

The Sacrifice of Isaac, considered as a whole, witnesses to the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Love of the Father, and the necessity for our mortifying the members of our body if the spirit in its ransomed body is to live eternally. There is no other event in Old Testament history which contains within itself so large and inclusive a view of all that is meant by Redemption.

A. T. Fryer.

Bath.

Scottish Bibles.

I have never seen any mention made of the fact that English Bibles printed in Scotland as a rule have different renderings in some places from those published in England.

As a rule Bibles printed in Scotland, in Jn 14^{6} read: 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life'; while Bibles printed in England omit the first copulate. The Revised Version inserts this copulate, for it is found in the Greek. Perhaps its omission is due to a typographical error, but this cannot be said of the second instance I would mention—this is in Jn $10^{28\text{-}29}$. Scottish Bibles read: 'And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.' This is in harmony with the Reviser's rendering; but Bibles printed in England give the word 'man' in both these verses as having been supplied by the Translators. How this variation has arisen it may be impossible to determine, but it would almost seem as if the first Scottish printers had for their copy a different translation from that supplied to the English printers. At any rate the Scottish Bibles in these places are the more correct.

J. H. Terras.

Wingham, New South Wales.

'I Buffet my Body.'

Why do Protestant commentators try to explain this sentence away? 'Buffet' (R.V.) is better than 'keep under' (A.V.), which is not a translation at all. The R.V. margin 'bruise' is still better. But the Rheims translation, 'I chastise my body' is best. Ὑπωπιάζω means 'I beat black and blue,' like an eye discoloured in fighting (see the previous verse). St. Paul is simply telling us that he used on himself the severe but wholesome discipline of the scourge.

D. R. Fotheringham.

Charing Vicarage.

Epiphany.

Jesu, Lord, we kneel before Thee;
Angels, Saints, and men adore Thee;
Hear us ever, we implore Thee,
By Thy birth in Bethlehem.

In the hollow rock abiding,
'Mid the soft-eyed oxen hiding,
Underneath Thy Father's guiding,
Thou wert born in Bethlehem.

In the East Thy Star of Ages
Rose o'er lands of ancient sages,
Till it led the Persian mages
To Thy cave at Bethlehem.

'Mid the lowing kine they sought Thee;
Gifts for gods and kings they brought Thee;
Prince and priest and God they thought Thee
Cradled there in Bethlehem.

Jesu, Lord, we kneel before Thee;
Angels, Saints, and men adore Thee;
Hear us ever, we implore Thee,
By thy birth in Bethlehem.

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

TWO TEXTS.

2 Cor. xiii. 14.

'WHAT is the meaning of the familiar phrase of St. Paul, "the communion (or the fellowship) of the Holy Ghost"? Does it mean a fellowship with the Spirit of God, or does it mean a fellowship among men produced by the Spirit of God? And the only possible answer, if we are true to the thought of St. Paul as well as to the thought of the whole New Testament, is that it means both, that it means one because it means the other. There is no fellowship with the Holy Spirit of God except as that fellowship is realized in the life of the children of God. And there is no final basis for a fellowship among men except the basis of a common fellowship with the Spirit of God. If a man truly seek God he must find his fellows, and if he would truly find his fellows he must find God.'[1]

Matt. xvi. 25.

'In many places "life" in our version represents not *ζωὴ* but *ψυχή*, which means the individual life—the nearest equivalent of "the Ego." Our translators have not dared to translate "he that wishes to save his *soul* shall lose it"; they have thus weakened one of the great texts of the Gospel, which means a real surrender of the Ego, not a mere willingness to face death. The soul has to die as Soul in order to live as Spirit.'[2]

SOME TOPICS.

The Details of the Resurrection.

Is it possible to conceive the circumstances which attended the rising of our Lord from the dead? And if it is possible, is it advisable? The Rev. Robert Stephen Hawker answered both questions in the affirmative. 'Hawker of Morwenstow' is still a name in the West Country—'a lover of animals and birds, a firm believer in ghosts and witchcraft, a champion of the Church, and a doughty antagonist of Dissenters.' Out of his Notebooks E. R. Appleton has gathered extracts and published them under the title of *Stones Broken from the Rocks* (Oxford: Blackwell; 4s. 6d. net). This is the note on the Resurrection:

'All the pictures of Our Lord's Resurrection disappoint me very much. They represent Him as flying out as a Bird; as soaring away from the Earth on which He tarried so long. My own conception of the Scene is this. Day glimmered in the East and the awful Shade of Jesus came back to the Sepulchre and glided in. It stood awhile beside the corpse and considered a little space its cold and helpless form: then that Spirit dissolved upon that form and mingled with it and gradually pervaded all its parts. Blood miraculous began to flow. The Heart slowly throbbed into life. Jesus began to awake. He lay a little to recall by slow degrees the scene. Then remembered He the Cross, the separate journey of His Soul, the return. Slowly, gravely, solemnly He sat up, with peaceful composure He took off the handkerchief from His brow and laid it aside. Then He stood upright and removed with gradual hand the vesture of death and shook off the spices of the grave. At this moment there was an earthquake; angels cast aside the doorstone and entered in. They had brought Him raiment such as they wear in Heaven, woven by angelic hands from the texture and hues of summer skies. They robed Him, and with slow and majestic footsteps came Jesus forth. The angels stayed. The Arisen walked to and fro beneath the trees of that Garden, and in the light of gathering day, and in a moment, the twinkling of an eye, was changed. He put on immortality then and there. Then returned He to the grave, and there at this time the Magdalene wept. She rushed towards Him with impatient haste. But He forbade her. A sensation repulsive of mortal contact thrilled His glorified form. "Touch Me not," He said.'

The Sheltered Life.

'To rear a boy under what parents call the "sheltered life system" is, if the boy must go into the world and fend for himself, not wise. Unless he be one in a thousand he has certainly to pass through many unnecessary troubles; and may,

[1] E. S. Drown, *The Creative Christ*, 32.
[2] Dean Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, 42.

possibly, come to extreme grief simply from ignorance of the proper proportions of things.

'Let a puppy eat the soap in the bathroom or chew a newly-blacked boot. He chews and chuckles until, by and by, he finds out that blacking and old Brown Windsor make him very sick; so he argues that soap and boots are not wholesome. Any old dog about the house will soon show him the unwisdom of biting big dogs' ears. Being young, he remembers and goes abroad, at six months, a well-mannered little beast with a chastened appetite. If he had been kept away from boots, and soap, and big dogs till he came to the trinity full-grown and with developed teeth, consider how fearfully sick and thrashed he would be! Apply that notion to the "sheltered life," and see how it works. It does not sound pretty but it is the better of two evils.'

Can you place this quotation? Of course you can. It is Kipling; and the story from which it is taken is called 'Thrown Away.' But suppose you have forgotten. How are you to find it? Well, there is no need to search laboriously through volume after volume of your edition of Kipling. Look for it first in *A Kipling Anthology: Prose* (Macmillan; 6s. net).

The Great Victorians.

'It was a good rule of Thomas Carlyle to set a portrait of the man whom he was describing in front of him on his writing-table. It is a practice which would greatly diminish the output of literary impertinence. Let those who are disposed to follow the present evil fashion of disparaging the great Victorians make a collection of their heads in photographs or engravings, and compare them with those of their own favourites. Let them set up in a row good portraits of Tennyson, Charles Darwin, Gladstone, Manning, Newman, Martineau, Lord Lawrence, Burne Jones, and, if they like, a dozen lesser luminaries, and ask themselves candidly whether men of this stature are any longer among us. I will not speculate on the causes which from time to time throw up a large number of great men in a single generation. I will only ask you to agree with me that since the golden age of Greece (assuming that we can trust the portrait busts of the famous Greeks) no age can boast so many magnificent types of the human countenance as the reign of Queen Victoria. . . . Let us have the decency to uncover before the great men of the last century; and if we cannot appreciate them, let us reflect that the fault may possibly be in ourselves.' [1]

The Mystics.

'The mystics, like other people, form these images, but they reject them one after another as unworthy. "God is not like this," they declare, as soon as any concrete image of Him has formed itself in their minds. Their method has been compared to peeling an onion; they have been said to grasp at the absolute, and to seize only zero. They do not think so themselves; and surely we are in far more danger from the heavy-handed dogmatist who wishes to arrest and stereotype the image-making faculty at a very crude stage, and to fix it in the same state for all, without regard to the great differences in temperament and education which divide human beings.' [2]

St. John and St. Paul.

'The Johannine writings . . . carry the theology of St. Paul to its logical conclusions. The Pauline churches needed a *Gospel*, partly because they were threatened with a "Gnostic" theosophy which encouraged mysticism without morality and virtually cut Christianity loose from the historical ministry of Christ, and partly because the existing gospels (our Synoptics and others) taught an *apotheosis*-Christology, whereas the Pauline churches had learnt an *incarnation*-Christology. So the unknown Fourth Evangelist stepped into the breach, and gave us a Gospel according to Paul, but enriched by a sublimely idealised—which does not at all mean an untrue—portrait of the Divine Founder.' [3]

Misquotation.

There is perhaps no text in the Bible so persistently misquoted as the ninth verse of the second chapter of 1st Corinthians. And, curiously enough, it is invariably misquoted in the same way. The latest offender is Dean Inge in his *Outspoken Essays*, where it is given thus: 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, the things that God hath prepared for

[1] Dean Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, 199.
[2] *Ibid.* 55.
[3] *Ibid.* 40.

them that love Him.' There is nothing in the text about conceiving unseen realities. St. Paul says: 'neither hath entered into the heart of man.' His point is that the natural 'heart' of man does not grasp present spiritual truth. It does not see God or His gifts. Only the spiritual sense, or the Spirit-taught mind, is capable of perceiving spiritual truth. The *natural* man does not see these things, 'but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.'

NEW POETRY.

M. D. H.

In an introduction to a little book of selected poems entitled *St. Hilda's Hall Verse* (Chaundy & Cox; 2s. 6d. net), John Drinkwater says: 'My preferences will not be everybody's, and I am not going to say which they are. There are at least half-a-dozen of the poems in your book that seem to have a clear and positive beauty of their own.' Is this, perhaps, one of them?

The Shadow.

The grey-yellow wheat
  These hot days of harvest
Stands stiff in the heat
  Up in the high field.

With glorious mirth
  The great sun, beaming
Down on the earth
  In blazing beneficence,

Deepens and warms
  The splendid colour
In men's curved arms
  As we gather the wheatsheaves.

On the hill crest
  The sun-bright cornfield
For a moment's rest
  Dims its intensity.

Her slow sky-way
  The cloud climbs lazily;
The edge of the grey
  Creeps down, caresses us.
Up from the sod
  We, the sun-worshippers,
Lift to our God
  Praise for the shadow.

E. M. Martin.

Mr. Martin, who will be remembered by two delightful books of Essays, *Wayside Wisdom* and *The Happy Fields*, has published a volume of verse. The title is *Apollo to Christ* (Chapman & Hall; 3s. 6d. net). Something of the delicate, pensive charm of Lamb was in Mr. Martin's earlier work. There were grey tints, but the sky was not all grey. But turn the pages of this book and you will not be reminded of Lamb. We shall quote:

Home-Comings.

When I came home from London
  What plans we used to make!
The world should be our football,
  And crumbling empires shake.
But castles that I built you
  Of dreams, and hopes, and fears,
The years have turned to ruin
  And drowned them with our tears.

When I came home from London
  I always met your smile,
If I brought disappointment
  'Twas 'only for a while.'
You knew that I should 'triumph,
  All would be well at last.'
Your faith set mine a-glowing
  Despite the warning past.

When I came home from London
  A grey and tired man,
You gave the same old welcome
  As only tried love can.
I brought you nought, save failure
  No fancy could beguile,
I came, the strong man broken,
  And yet—you kept your smile.

L. D'O. Walters.

Poems, by L. D'O. Walters (Daniel ; 3s. 6d. net). The poems are all short—practically a poem to a page ; and there are ninety-six pages. There are perhaps no great heights attained, but the poems are simple, natural, musical, and their author has a real command of many metres. Here is our preference among the shorter ones :

THE TIRED BODY.

A long dream of dreams,
A long sleep to sleep,
Where the weight of the world lies deep and deep,
Or the tides of the seas move slow and slow,
With no morning to dawn, no night to go.
O there shall I rest,
O there shall I sleep,
With all life behind me, and peace to reap.

Robin Flower.

First the poet and then the anthologist. We have the anthologist now. His name, the name of the arch-anthologist, is J. E. Wetherell, B.A. And his most recent anthology is of *Later English Poems* (Toronto : McClelland & Stewart). The word later covers the years 1901 to 1922. The choice is very careful. One feature worth noting is the recovery of good quotable passages out of long poems. There is such a passage rescued from the Poet Laureate's 'Britannia Victrix,' another from Hardy's 'The Dynasts,' and another from Newbolt's 'The Service.'

Sixty-nine poets are presented to us. 'In selecting the sixty or seventy who were adequately to represent in this anthology the poetry of the first two decades of the century, the editor had no difficulty with the first thirty names. Thereafter came industrious search, the constant exercise of individual taste and preference, and a careful consideration of the opinions of other anthologists.' For his encouragement we shall say that the last forty have given us more pleasure than the first thirty. Out of their number we choose one, Robin Flower, and his only poem :

TIR NA N-OG.

I heard the summer calling across great breadths of sea
In the landwind and the seawind and the wind of gramarie ;
For the seawind speaks in thunder and the landwind whispers low,
But the little wind of faery you scarce can hear it blow.

But listen, listen, listen, and you shall hear afar
A low and lovely murmur like the singing of a star ;
But listen, listen, listen, till all things fade and fall
And the lone and luring music is master over all.

And you shall hear it chanting in one triumphant chime
Of the life that lives for ever and the fugitives of time,
Beyond the green land's border and the washing wastes of sea
In the world beyond the world's end, where nothing is but glee.

The magic waters gird it, and skies of laughing blue
Keep always faith with summer, and summer still is true ;
There is no end of dancing and sweet unceasing song,
And eyes to eyes make answer, and love with love grows strong.

But close your ears and silence the crying of your heart
Lest in the world of mortals you walk a man apart ;
For O ! I heard the music and answered to the call,
And the landwind mocks my longing and the seawind saddens all.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. L. P. Jacks, the well-known Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, has written an interesting and helpful book on *Religious Perplexities*, which is reviewed under 'Literature.' In his last chapter he discusses the perplexities that are felt about the Christian Religion.

He admits the failure of Christianity, and deals severely with Christian apologists who explain it away. Two reasons are given by apologists to account for the failure. One is that Christianity has never been tried. The other is that the influence of moral or spiritual ideas is always slow and gradual in its effects. Dr. Jacks calls these reasons 'flagrant dishonesties,' and this is the only lapse from good taste in a book that is singularly fine in its tone and spirit.

Dr. Jacks' own explanation is that the failure has not been that of the Christian Religion, but of a system that has been superimposed upon it. And the perplexities that are felt about Christianity are not about real Christianity, but about its 'entanglements.' It has become entangled with philosophies, with dogmatic systems, with political ideas, with the vested interests of great institutions; and especially with the habits of mind which have grown up with these things. 'These entanglements are another name for our perplexities. They are so many and so deep that it becomes a matter of difficulty to extract the original genius of Christianity.'

When we see this, and discover the true nature of Christianity, we are rid at once of all perplexity. There is nothing in it to be perplexed about. Christianity, in the official, or authorized, presentation of it, is a *smothered* religion. If you take it along with its encumbrances and unnatural alliances, you will find it a hopelessly perplexing thing, a thing which neither Reason nor Faith can accept.

What then is Christianity? When we turn to the first three Gospels we find it in its elemental purity. The Gospel is neither a sermon nor a treatise on religion; but a *story*, which tells how Christianity began in something that happened, in a deed that was done, in a life that was lived. There we touch the dynamic of Christianity. In the beginning was the deed: go thou and do likewise. So presented, Christianity is not perplexing; but quite the most convincing religion ever offered either to the intellect or to the heart. The religion of Jesus is the spirit of a great comradeship, with man and with God, and a call to us to make the same experiment.

All through his argument Dr. Jacks summons his readers to adopt the heroic attitude to life,

for this is the solvent of religious perplexity. And Christianity is the supreme call to this heroism. It is very simple. It is reducible to two words: 'Follow me.' But, while Christianity is as simple as that, it is by no means an easy religion. 'It is the simplest and most difficult religion in the world,' says Dr. JACKS. For you must follow not only by the shining shores of the Lake of Galilee, but into the Garden of Gethsemane and along the Via Dolorosa.

The religion of heroism is to be found in Christianity. Yes, and in other religions also. 'Far be it from me to set up an exclusive claim for Christianity at this point. Any one who does that goes a long way towards forfeiting his title to be called a Christian. Let each of us look for truth where it is most accessible and where it speaks the language he best understands. For most of us here, Christianity has this advantage. It gives the sharpest point to the challenge of life as we know life.'

Such is the solution of Christian perplexities which Dr. JACKS offers. Two things may be said of it. It is too easy, and it is too difficult. It is too easy, because perplexity is felt mainly about one point which does not seem to have occurred to Dr. JACKS. Has God spoken to man in any final and conclusive way? Has the silence of the eternal been broken in a fashion to which we can apply the words 'unique' or 'final'? Dr. JACKS would probably say, God has spoken everywhere and always, through all the great religious teachers. And we would all say the same. But we say it because 'in these last days He has spoken in His Son.' If we can say that Jesus is the Word, the expression of God's whole being and of His will for man, the whole world is full of Him and all history is religious.

But the solution of Dr. JACKS is too difficult also. It is the example of Jesus. That is religion. But is this a *religion* at all? Is it a *gospel*? Just in proportion as Jesus is great does His example cease to influence us. The example of One who lived in a totally different age from ours and in different conditions, and was a 'supreme moral genius' is not likely to appeal to men. We cannot be surprised at the 'failure' of Christianity if this is Christianity. Indeed, what is so surprising as to be quite inexplicable is the revolution it worked in the world and in human life.

As a matter of fact, the example of Jesus *was* a power precisely because it was not a mere example. With it was the Spirit of holiness, the redeeming and uplifting ministry of a living Saviour. The crucial fact in Christian belief is the fact of a risen Christ and the moral dynamic of the Spirit He has sent into the hearts of men. This alone has made the example of Jesus a creative force in human life.

There are religious questions we are keeping back at present. We have to solve the greatest question of all, the Person of Christ. But in Christianity one question raises and one question solves another. It may be unwise to isolate in argument that which cannot be isolated in fact. Our doctrine of the Person of Christ may depend upon our doctrine of Revelation.

Professor DROWN believes that it does. The Rev. Edward S. DROWN, D.D., Professor in the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, Massachusetts, has published a study of the Incarnation in terms of modern thought, and called it *The Creative Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). In it he asks the question, 'How is God known?'

God is known through revelation, is his answer. And by revelation he means experience. He is careful to explain that the knowledge of God is not put on a plane by itself. 'How does a child come to know his mother? Only as the mother reveals herself to him. The child must have experience of his mother, experiences that come

through sight, sound, touch. But through these sensations the mother reveals herself, and the child knows her care, her patience, her love. Our friends reveal themselves to us through our senses, and through our sensations we have experience of what our friends really are.' Experience and revelation are but different names for the same thing.

How is God revealed? By nature? If so, He cannot be a God of love, for nature is full of horrors, 'red in tooth and claw.' Nature at best only partially reveals God.

Is He revealed by impersonal means, in signs and omens, through the flight of birds, by the entrails of sacrificial victims? This was the belief of the religions of Greece and Rome. And as the revelation was by impersonal means, so the conception of the Deity was impersonal. In the N.T. there are isolated instances of such revelations—the main revelation being very different—but Professor DROWN lays little stress on them. There is the incident of the casting of lots to decide whom God chose to take the place of Judas. With regard to this he says, 'the instance stands alone.' St. Paul's vision of the man from Macedonia 'cannot be separated from his waking thoughts and aspirations.'

In the O.T. the revelation is personal; it is through human life. 'Of course the religion of Israel emerged only slowly from the nature religions among which it had its birth, and naturally we find traces of lower forms of thought; dreams and ecstatic visions play a part. But their part is utterly subordinate to the belief that God was revealed in life. Through persons God's word was spoken. And it came to persons not in remoteness of life, but as leaders of life. Moses, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah—these men were patriots and statesmen, men standing in the market-place, and proclaiming the Divine will of justice and righteousness and truth.' 'And not only in individual prophets here and there came the word of God. Israel felt that the whole nation was the means of God's revelation, that God's character was to be revealed in the upbuilding of a righteous commonwealth, where the justice and truth and mercy of God should form the basis of a human society reflecting and revealing the divine life.'

The revelation in the N.T. is essentially by one Life. 'The gospel begins with the teaching of Jesus. And He becomes to His followers the essential contents of the message which He taught. The beginning of the apostolic preaching is that Jesus is the Christ. His followers find in Him the reality of the kingdom which is to manifest the ways of God. St. Paul resolved to know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. To him Christ is the image of the invisible God. To St. John He is the Word of God become flesh. No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him. He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father.'

Christ is not the revelation of God in the sense that He reveals truths concerning God. That takes too low a view of revelation. The character, the purpose, the will of God are revealed in Christ Jesus. The Father is given in His Son. The incarnate Jesus is the Word become flesh. He is the God-man. It is the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

On What Authority? Dr. KNOX has rewritten his last charge as Bishop of Manchester, and published it under this title (Longmans, Green & Co.; pp. 281, 7s. 6d.). Very definitely does he tell us for whom it is written, and for whom it is not. It is not for 'those who accept their beliefs as part of a spiritual inheritance which they may learn to defend, but which they never seriously question.' Nor is it 'for that far larger class who are not troubled by doubt because they are satisfied by

vagueness and indefiniteness in their attitude to the spiritual world. They regard their haziness as a sign of breadth, even nobility of mind.' 'It is written for those—who seriously believe in the duty of honouring God with all their mind, as well as with all their heart and soul. For they are conscious that they cannot really love God unless they know Him, and know Him as truly as He can be known by the best and most unsparing intellectual effort at their command.'

Dr. KNOX's mind has little sympathy with the former class that he rules out. He tells us, indeed, that his own faith is still in essentials, what it was in his college days. But then, between the glories of the rising and the setting sun, similar though they are, there lies the whole width of the earth. And here is a mind that has thought and read and brooded for a lifetime, facing the problems of a difficult transition age with hardihood and honesty, and it emerges from it all as it began—still a warm evangelical, who finds that that faith meets all calls upon it.

Nor has he any love for vagueness and indefiniteness. Nothing could well be clearer than his views and attitude, than that half-page in which he dismisses the help others would fain find in the Mysteries as a vain thing, than his handling of Mr. Wells' amateur incursion into theology, than his criticisms of the Modernists, than his quiet amusement over the Higher Critics' caution (he has counted up a hundred such words as 'perhaps' and 'probably' in one of Dr. Kennett's articles), and their hesitation here and there where they once trode with firmness, than his whole treatment of the difficulties about Inspiration and the like. Nobody, as a rule, can be at any loss to know exactly where our author stands.

But sometimes that haziness he so dislikes comes creeping in. About the Old Testament, for instance. Dr. KNOX does not like that phrase, 'the record of a progressive revelation,' which others find so helpful. Yet he admits that there is obvious progress. He concedes willingly that modern criticism has resulted in great gains, and that in any case facts must be faced, whether they lead to gain or to the opposite; still he is not altogether happy, feels that the net result is serious, that the gains are intellectual gains, but that somehow the New book left to us has not the old spiritual power. There, indeed, is a problem worth considering! Probably the majority of scholars will declare that God's Word has become far more His Word to them than ever; that the new light that has been cast upon it has made God's presence in it doubly clear. But it is probably as true that as yet many ordinary folk do feel that they have lost something, which evidently means that no little part of the preacher's duty these days must be to make people realize that, in place of the older more mechanical views, they now possess something vastly grander, and more serviceable for their souls, which surely is the simple fact.

But it is when we come to our Lord's personality and death that here and there over the sunny landscape there lie little patches of trailing mist. Dr. KNOX has a reverent mind. Face to face with Jesus Christ he admits a mystery that baffles him. And yet squarely, as usual, he faces it, and tries to feel his way. To begin with, he is not greatly helped by studies of the Historical Jesus. 'He who would understand aright the humanity of Jesus Christ must turn from the modern tendency to understand it by dramatizing it, that is, by reproducing the Palestinian Jew and erecting Him into Friend, Hero, Teacher, Master, with all the limitations of His age and surroundings. There is more truth than some would have us believe in holding that he who would know the manhood of Christ, must study Him as Man, as Son of Man, rather than as a man.' That is a feeling and reaction growing daily commoner in many minds.

As to our Lord's death, he is most helped by the old metaphor of sacrifice, 'The Christ who is not a sacrifice for Sin, is not the Christ of the New Testament.' And yet nothing is plainer in the

Gospels than that Our Lord carefully trained His disciples in the doctrine of immediate forgiveness of sins. How then does this other view appear? Dr. KNOX falls back on 'The Testimonies,' as Dr. Rendel Harris calls his collection of old Testament quotations from the Gospels and Epistles and early Fathers, and his view that a book of these for convincing Jews existed before any of the Gospels, and holds that these were chosen because of 'a looking back to them from the point of view of Jesus Himself.' He it was who taught the Church to think of His own death as an atonement by His view of the O.T. But why, then, in His teaching has this doctrine so undeniably small a place? Dr. KNOX says he cannot answer, chiefly because 'we cannot penetrate into the mysteries of His self-consciousness.'

Are we then altogether baffled? Can nothing be made of that consciousness and nature? Dr. KNOX holds that the contents of our Lord's consciousness, as seen in the Gospels, have been demonstrated 'thoroughly and repeatedly,' and yet he doubts whether it can really be done at all, but makes up his mind that he will try at least to aid us to some understanding of it. He will have nothing to do with Dr. Rashdall and his views of Christ, which make worship, so it seems to him, 'not an act of devotion, but a very strenuous metaphysical exercise.' 'We are brought back to realities, he says, and must make a decision.' The Christ of the New Testament is God, and is to be worshipped as God. 'He is Omnipotent,' but it is a 'restrained omnipotence, else He would have had no occasion to pray: the mere exercise of His will would have sufficed for all His needs.' He is also Omniscient. But 'omniscient within the limits imposed by His self-chosen Manhood.' 'The infallibility of Jesus—we say it with all reverence and consciousness of our fallibility—was not due to the superseding of human fallibility by divine omniscience.' He 'did not use His omniscience to concern Himself with modern scientific discoveries.' Moreover, He 'did not use' His omniscience in writing the gospel He might have done, but stooped to our limitations, and gave only the best that we were likely to follow.

And if the bewildered mind asks, But how, and in what sense, is that tired, dusty man sitting there on the well-head to be thought of as God? Dr. KNOX answers that 'no little patience is needed to reach the truth even approximately,' but that we are likeliest to do it by considering our own personalities. Here, as in other places he founds upon Professor Wallace. 'In the little physical individual which is alive—in the single subject or living soul which is a mere point excluding all others and excluded by them, there is a potential universality,' and when we turn to Jesus Christ 'we are conscious, however we account for it, that this universality is not potential but actual, restrained certainly, but actual.'

In his new book, *Belief in Christ*, Dr. GORE has an interesting passage on the influences under which our Lord transformed the original idea of the 'Christ.' That He did radically change it, and of set purpose, there can be no doubt. The current idea was connected with visions of worldly glory and dominion for Israel, and before He allowed Himself to be openly identified with the traditional hope of His people, Jesus set Himself to transfigure the whole Messianic conception.

There cannot be any doubt, says Dr. GORE, that this was done by our Lord identifying Himself, the Son of Man, with the Suffering Servant of Jehovah in the later Isaiah. The astonishing vision of the prophet in the fifty-third chapter appears to have made little or no impression on the imagination of Israel. They never identified the Messiah with the Suffering Servant. This was the work of Jesus. Two things seem to prove this: (1) That our Lord plainly regards the sufferings of the Christ and His death as necessary because prefigured in Scripture. 'The Son of Man goeth, as it is written of him.' And the same

intense conviction of prophecy and fulfilment appears in the earliest Church and was associated from the beginning with the figure of 'the Servant of Jehovah.'

A second proof is the way Jesus quotes at Nazareth the 'Servant' section of Isaiah to interpret His mission, and later uses of His own end the words of the prophet: 'He was reckoned among the transgressors.' Jesus therefore associated both the 'Christ' and the 'Suffering Servant' with the title He had chosen for Himself, 'the Son of Man.' Henceforth the Man, the Christ, and the Suffering Servant are the same person.

But one more step had to be taken to complete our Lord's profoundly new doctrine of the Christ, and that was to introduce in a new way what was already suggested in Is 53, the idea of resurrection and glory. Jesus did this by identifying the Christ with the figure of glorified manhood in the visions of Daniel. It must be insisted on that for the crowd and for the disciples 'The Son of Man' was not a term which had Messianic associations. Probably the Book of Enoch had already interpreted the human figure in the great passage of Daniel as being a mysterious person who is to be manifested in the clouds as God's vicegerent in judgment at the end of the world. Our Lord could therefore use this as a means of extending the meaning of His own title, the Son of Man, and giving to the conception of the Christ its new meaning. In point of fact, Jewish Messianic ideas were confused and vague. Our Lord was the first to give them spiritual coherence.

This, then, was the final element introduced by our Lord into the conception of the Messiah. He was not a mysterious angelic being, but a man born of a woman; then the Suffering Servant who wins redemption for many by his own sacrifice; and finally, one who is to pass to resurrection and glory, and the 'awful dignity' of the Judge of the world. The Son of Man is to come 'in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.'

'The conception of the Messiah which Jesus caused to grow in the minds of the disciples was profoundly original in the sense that it took up all the elements of ancient prophecy and recent interpretation, and combined them in a whole in His own person—in a whole which, while it realized their best spirit, was quite remote from the expectations of His contemporaries.' In this way all the elements of the Self-consciousness of Jesus—His humble manhood, His suffering, and His exaltation to life and the throne of judgment—were fused into a unity that was profoundly new.

'It is worse than futile—it is disastrous—to try to meet the need of our own day for a Gospel by dropping out of sight the eternal realities of redeeming love and forgiving compassion, and preaching instead, not the Jewish law, but a new and better law suited for the twentieth century—a law of service. Of course it is intelligible and interesting, it is divine and beautiful and most truly Christian, and the conscience yields assent. But it no more meets a man's immemorial hunger for God and for the daily refreshment of His love and mercy, than the call to pay our debts assures us of a comfortable income.' The words occur in a series of posthumous papers of Henry KINGMAN, published under the title of *The Place of Jesus in the Life of To-day* (Association Press; $1.25).

Did Dr. KINGMAN lack sympathy with the law of service? Was his ear dull to that heavenly call that rises clear above the discordant voices of the age and thrills the noblest hearts in Christendom?

Let the record of his life answer for him. In his college days he heard the call of the Foreign Field, and laboured in North China till invalided home. Thereafter, with broken health, in much pain and weakness, he ministered to a large Congregational Church in Claremont, California, where he went on 'playing the game and putting up a

brave fight' to the last, because, as he said, 'What else is there to do?'

Yes, he had heard and obeyed the call. But he knew by experience that a heavenly call can be obeyed only in the power of a heavenly impulse. And this impulse is given by 'Jesus the Bringer of Love' to those who put their trust in Him. Browning, in his 'Epitaph of one of Nero's Slaves,' puts in his mouth the familiar words:

> I was some time in being burned,
> But at the close a hand came through
> The fire above my head, and drew
> My soul to Christ, whom now I see.

'A hand came through,'—that was the Gospel as Henry KINGMAN knew it, preached it, lived it. And would not Paul have said that there was no other, not though an angel from heaven proclaimed it?

St. Paul and Aristophanes.

By J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., MANCHESTER.

FEW passages in the New Testament are so perplexing, alike to the textual critic and the commentator, as the second chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians, in which St. Paul denounces a teacher or teachers who are propagating some ill-defined heresy in the Colossian church. It is commonly held that these dark shadows which fall across the early history of this famous church are cast by Jewish forms; perhaps they are Essene as well as Jewish; but they are so ill-defined that one might write a volume of speculative comments about them, without bringing the shadows into reality. The text of Colossians in this chapter is held by the best critics to be in a very bad state of preservation, but even where the textual critic finds it plain sailing, the language is so inflated and grotesque as to leave us wondering—not only what the ultimate sense of the words can be—but whether they are really apostolic in origin, and from the same hand and brain that produced the Epistle to the Galatians or the Epistle to the Romans. However, something can be done by the textual critics to help us into clearness of vision and understanding. At all events, they will tell us to drop the negative in 2^{18} (*ἃ μὴ ἑόρακεν ἐμβατεύων*), on the ground of its late and inadequate attestation, even if they cannot tell us what *θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ* can mean: and if the critic is not afraid to use the art of conjectural emendation, he will be able to rescue a clause or two from the chaos in which the words are now swimming. Let us see how far inquiry has progressed in this regard. First of all, we write down the text of two closely related verses in which the worst obscurities are found:

Col 2^{18}, *μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ ἑόρακεν ἐμβατεύων, εἰκῇ φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.*

Col 2^{23}, *ἅτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφιάς ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος.*

With regard to the first of these notes, Hort writes in his *Select Readings* as follows:

'Dr. Lightfoot has with good reason revived a suggestion of Alexander More and Courcelles that the (last) word *ἐμβατεύων* must be taken with the three preceding letters, so as to make *κενεμβατεύων*; at the same time, in place of *ἃ ἑόρακεν* he suggests *ἑώρᾳ* or *αἰώρᾳ*, a word twice used by Philo in similar contexts appropriate here. On the whole, however, *ἀέρα*, conjectured by Dr. C. Taylor, (*Journ. of Philol.*, 1876, xiii. 130 ff.), is still more probable; the transitive construction is amply attested for *ἐμβατεύω* and presents no difficulty with *ἀέρα*.

ΑΕΡΑΚΕΝΕΜΒΑΤΕΥΩΝ differs from ΑΕΟΡΑΚΕΝΕΜΒΑΤΕΥΩΝ only by the absence of ο after ε.'

Having thus given his benediction to the Taylor emendation at the cost of the abandonment, in part, of the parallels which Lightfoot adduced from Philo, Dr. Hort went on to say of v.^{23} that 'no probable emendation has been suggested. This

Epistle, and more especially the second chapter, appears to have been ill-preserved in ancient times; and it may be that some of the harshnesses which we have left unmarked are really due to primitive corruption.'

This very judicious summary provoked the wrath and the merriment of Dean Burgon as follows:

'Col 2^{18}, ἃ μὴ ἑώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, *prying into the things he hath not seen*; where ℵ*ABD* and a little handful of suspicious (*sic*!) documents leave out the *not*. Our Editors, rather than recognize this blunder (so obvious and ordinary!) are for conjecturing (as above); which (if it means anything at all) may as well mean "proceeding on an airy foundation to offer an empty conjecture!" Dismissing that conjecture as worthless, etc. . . . the Traditional Text cannot seriously be suspected of error.'[1]

Upon which pronouncement I remarked that it was 'witty but not wise.' The emendation was, in any case, slight, was arrived at gradually, and took one from the region of the obscure into what was sufficiently lucid. Now let us see if we can go a step further with Lightfoot's assistance.

First of all, Lightfoot points out that κενεμβατεύων and its equivalent κενεμβατεῖν is not a rare form of speech, nor one that is inappropriate to the Colossian situation; he says:

'The word κενεμβατεῖν, "to walk on emptiness," to "tread the air," and so metaphorically (like ἀεροβατεῖν, αἰθεροβατεῖν, αἰθερεμβατεῖν, etc.) "to indulge in vain speculations," is not an uncommon word.'

'(These) striking parallels (from Philo) show how germane to St. Paul's subjects these ideas of "suspension or balancing in the air" (ἐώρᾳ or αἰώρᾳ) and "treading the void" (κενεμβατεύων) would be, as expressing at once the spiritual pride and the emptiness of these speculative mystics.' Lightfoot's equivalent expressions at once suggest the origin of the Pauline language.

In Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 225, there is a famous situation where Socrates is seen suspended in a basket, and when asked what he is doing, he replies:

ἀεροβατῶ καὶ περιφρονῶ τὸν ἥλιον.

'I tread on air and contemplate the sun.'

That is the most important line in the whole play as far as quotation goes. It was referred to by Socrates himself at his trial, when he alludes to the treatment he had received at the hands of a certain comic poet, to the effect that there is 'one Socrates carried about (in a basket) and saying that he treads on air (ἀεροβατεῖν), along with a lot more foolery.' Every one who knew anything of Greek life or of Greek literature would know this famous line. It has been borrowed with slight modification, of the form but not of the sense, by St. Paul. He describes his Colossian philosopher in the way that Aristophanes denounced Socrates.

As soon as we have decided that St. Paul was under the influence of the *Clouds*, and that one can see through the turbid language of the Epistle to the Colossians the form of Socrates, considered as the *bête noire* of people who distrusted philosophy and philosophers, we are obliged to make a change in our manner of interpreting the Epistle. It is not any longer in order for us to restrict the Colossian heresy to Jewish—that is to say, to Essene speculations. If the Essenes come in at all they must come in with the philosopher's cloak as worn at Athens: and in that case the hostility of St. Paul to philosophy must be more comprehensive than has generally been supposed. If the troublesome people at Colosse were merely Judaizing Gnostics, what would be the use of quoting Aristophanes to them, or showing Socrates on the film in a basket, with an attached reprobation?

In Col 2^{8}, Paul warns the people to whom he writes that they are to beware of false teachers who make a prey of them through philosophy and vain deceit. It has been a matter of serious discussion among theologians, from the days of Clement of Alexandria until now, whether this means that the Church is committed, through Paul, to an anti-philosophic attitude. Tertullian, for instance, when he runs up against philosophy, will have none of it; Clement will have all of it, except the absolutely indigestible portions. Lightfoot takes a middle course and suggests that it was only a special philosophy and a particular teacher that is being antagonized. 'Philosophy is not condemned, it is (only) disparaged by the connexion in which it is placed.' It is bad, in respect that it is Jewish, it would be good if it were Greek. But what will happen if the Jew and the Greek are teaching the same thing? Let it be granted that there is a school of Jewish philosophers at Colosse

[1] *The Revision Revised*, pp. 355, 356.

who are causing trouble; if St. Paul compares them to Socrates on an aeroplane, and makes their angel-worship parallel to cloud-worship, how shall we shut them up again into Dead-Sea hermitages who have been under the open sky at Athens? The fact is that the dividing-line cannot be drawn, and St. Paul does not profess to draw it.

We can approach Colossian speculation from two sides, but the two roads are really one. Take, for instance, the asceticism of the teaching which is condemned in the Epistle: its formula is said to be 'Don't touch and don't taste.' It is usual to illustrate this spirit of abstinence from Talmudic sources, and from the descriptions which we have of Essene life. But ascetic practice is not so easily delimited. In the *Clouds* Socrates appears as an ascetic, with bare feet and pallid cheek, and when the Clouds advise Strepsiades how to become a disciple of the philosopher, he is told that he must never tire, nor feel the cold, nor long for his meals, and that he must abstain from wine and the gymnasium. This may be regarded as an expansion of the ascetic rule given above; and it should be remembered that Aristophanes in the *Clouds* is not always laughing at Socrates: he has limits to the sport that he allows himself. If asceticism were divorced from novel opinions he would, perhaps, cease altogether from criticism of the philosophers. It seems, then, that the formula which St. Paul quotes need not be a Jewish rule; on the other hand, there are signs in the text that whatever might be the origin of the rule, or the extent of its diffusion, the Apostle meant to apply it to Judaizers. The proof of this is interesting. He says that the application of the rule is *κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας ἀνθρώπων*. Now this is an Old Testament quotation—but it is more than a quotation, it is a Testimony; and it is more than a Testimony, it is a *Testimonium adv. Judæos*. It is an Old Testament quotation, for it agrees very nearly with Is 29^{13}: *μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με, διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας*. It is also a Testimony, for it occurs in Mk 7^{7} (and from Mark in Mt 15^{9}) in the form *μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων*. And that it is a Testimony against the Jews appears not only from the preface in Mark ('appropriately did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites'), but also from its occurrence in writers who are known to use written and collected *Testimonies*, such as Justin. For Justin also employs Isaiah's language with regard to the people 'whose heart is far from God' (*Dial.* 39), and makes his proof not from the Gospel but directly from the prophet.

Lightfoot, who did not know the use of collected Testimonies in the first Christian generation, could not recognize the meaning of St. Paul's language. He imagined him to be using the Gospels, Mark or Matthew, or both. 'The coincidences,' says he, 'in St. Paul's language with our Lord's words as related in the Gospels (Mt 15^{1-20}, Mk 7^{1-23}) are striking and suggest that the Apostle had this discourse in his mind.' The suggestion is unnecessary. All that can be inferred is that St. Paul made use of an anti-Judaic Testimony in his letter to the Colossians. He treats, then, the people whom he denounced as being both philosophers and Jews.

As soon as we have made it clear that the language of Aristophanes is involved in the Epistle to the Colossians, we can take another step in the elucidation of the textual and intellectual confusion of the second chapter. In v.[23] the false teachers are charged with *ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ* and *ταπεινοφροσύνῃ*, and it is usually explained that this means a worship in the will of the creature and a false and affected humility. When we look back at v.[18] we see traces of the same defects; here we have the phrases *θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ* and *θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων*. The first expression is unmeaning; if, however, we remove *θέλων* and restore *ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ* we shall have a close parallel with the language of v.[23]. But what does *ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ* mean? evidently this also is corrupt; if we restore *ἐν νεφελοθρησκείᾳ* we shall have an expression capable of explanation from Aristophanes; the worship of angels is, like the new religion in the Greek comedy, a worship of the clouds. An affectation of humility and a cloud-cult of angels, that is what is amiss with the new teachers. A reference to Aristophanes will show the place of the clouds in the supposed theology of Socrates. Socrates, for instance, introduces Strepsiades to the Clouds as 'these divinities of ours,' *ταῖς ἡμετέραις δαίμοσιν* (l. 252).

In l. 316 they are called *οὐρανίαι Νεφέλαι, μεγάλαι θεαὶ ἀνδράσιν ἀργοῖς*. They are the 'great goddesses revered by idle men,' and throughout the play, where the abolition of Zeus is assumed, they take the form of a Chorus of maidens, and

decide the destinies of the performers. How easily such an expression as ἐν νεφελοθρησκείᾳ could be corrupted into ἐν ἐθελοφρησκείᾳ is obvious.

Let us now look a little deeper into the acquaintance of St. Paul with the play of Aristophanes. Is it more than a mere reminiscence of a formula, according to which Socrates was made to say that he 'trod on air and contemplated the sun'? That single expression would, no doubt, be the extent of the popular remembrance, just as the appearance of Socrates in a basket would be the popular memory of the dramatic action. Can we go further than this? Is there any sign that his mind suggested to Paul more than the bare reference and the single word ἀεροβατεῖν? When we think over the play and ask what it means, the next thing that occurs to us is what suggested itself to Milton, that it is a drama of 'the Worse and the Better Reason,' such as Belial was expert in. The author wants to show, by personification of the two Reasons, how easily the Worse outwits the Better, and that philosophy is the art of doing this. So he introduced old Strepsiades the farmer, whose son has left him to pay for his horses and associated extravagances; and then he sends Strepsiades first, and later his son Pheidippides, to study under Socrates, in order to find out how to escape the payment of their debts. This question of the accumulated debts, and the use of philosophy as a means of repudiation, runs right through the play. It might almost be called, *Philosophy, or a New Way to pay Old Debts.* Socrates puts Strepsiades through a catechism. What would he do if the first of the month was at hand and interest was lawfully due? Strepsiades suggests that he would buy a young Thessalian witch, pull down the moon (a well-known art of the Thessalian women), and put it under lock and key. Then the Calendar, being lunar, would be stopped.

Socrates puts another case: suppose judgment is being entered against you for ten talents, what would you do by way of escape? Strepsiades suggests that he would get the burning-glass in the chemist's shop, take it into court, and, standing some way off, concentrate the sun's rays on the adverse sentence that is being written against him, and erase the letters from the wax tablets of the judges. Socrates asks again what his pupil would do if he had one day left to pay the debt: Strepsiades says he would hang himself the day before the debt became due; they cannot collect revenue from a corpse. And so, finally, Socrates has nothing further to teach him, and dismisses him.

Now is it an accident that in the Epistle St. Paul speaks of a legal document that was adverse to us, and explains how Jesus erased the writing and (so to speak) crucified the document? And is it accidental that he so strongly, in this very chapter, affirms the death of a debtor and his consequent release from obligations of a legal nature? What philosophy, so called, could not do, St. Paul represents Jesus as doing. He tells the Colossian believers that they died with Christ, and that their life is now a secret one with Christ in God, and without any fear of being arrested by old-time creditors. No doubt this explanation will seem very strange, and it is quite unlike the conventional exegesis of the New Testament. Yet it flows naturally enough from the single supposition that St. Paul knew the *Clouds*, had read the play, or even seen it acted. There is nothing stranger in his making use of this knowledge than there is in his quoting the *Ion* of Euripides at the time of the Jerusalem riot; for we showed some time ago that the reference to Tarsus as 'no mean city' was taken from the speech of Hermes concerning Athens at the opening of Euripides' play.

We shall sum up the matter as follows: in the second chapter of Colossians there are suggestions of literary parallelism with the *Clouds* of Aristophanes; and it is possible that an acquaintance with the play and its scorn of philosophy may give a clue to the treatment of Colossian heretics by St. Paul, to his denunciation of Colossian speculations, and to his explanation of Christianity as being also a New Way to pay Old Debts.

The following comments of Dr. T. K. Abbott will show that we have correctly represented the financial side of the passages of the Epistle to which we have referred:

> 2^{14}. ἐξαλείψας, 'blotting out' . . . strictly it means 'wiping out or away,' '*cera obducta* delere.' . . . τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον, 'the bond that was against us.' χειρόγραφον, properly an autograph, was in later Greek a technical term for *an acknowledgment of debt*. . . . Here the χειρόγραφον is the Mosaic Law, which, being unfulfilled, is analogous to an unpaid '*note of hand*.'

In the foregoing inquiry we followed Hort in support of the Taylor emendation as against the almost equivalent one of Lightfoot. It brought us at once to the language of Aristophanes. It is interesting to observe that Lightfoot's correction pointed in the same direction. For if we turn to Pollux and his *Onomasticon* (iv. 130, 131), to find out what apparatus is used on a Greek stage, for performers who have to be raised into the air or carried through the air, we find that they employ a crane (the same word that we use) to carry off a suspended body, as when the Dawn carries off the body of Memnon; or else a system of ropes, called *αἰώραι*, which are attached to the top of the stage, to support heroes or gods, who are to seem to walk upon the air. In the *Clouds* the word used is *κρεμάθρα*, 'suspender,' and is commonly but doubtfully rendered by 'basket'; it is evidently the same thing as *αἰώρα*; and, as the commentators say, is meant to give supernatural dignity to Socrates in a ridiculous manner. The conventional Greek prefaces to the *Clouds* actually tell us that Socrates appears *ἐπὶ κρεμάθρας αἰωρούμενος*. If Lightfoot had not been so bent on giving an abstract, speculative sense to *αἰώρα*, he would have found his way into the Greek theatre at the time when the *Clouds* was being performed.

There is still a great deal to be done in elucidation of the obscure and inflated language of Colossians. It is pretty certain, for instance, that *ταπεινοφροσύνῃ* is wrong. The imitation of Socrates can hardly be expressed in that term: but what is the original word? Is it perhaps *περιφροσύνῃ*, as in the speech of Socrates, where he *contemplates* the sun (*περιφρονῶ τὸν ἥλιον*)? The objection would be that the correction is not quite near enough to the word corrected, especially when we reflect that the word occurs twice. Another suggestion, very near to the existing text, would be to read *πατεινοφροσύνῃ*, giving the sense to the whole passage of 'a cloud-cult and bird-lore of angels.' But perhaps we have made enough changes in the text for the present, and may leave the rest of the textual perplexities for future study, by ourselves and others. Our task has been to bring Socrates into the New Testament, and into Pauline mentality. The latter part of the process was not very difficult, for we remember that Tarsus was a University town, with a great philosophical school, whose influence upon St. Paul's mind, perhaps at the formative period and before his attaching himself to Gamaliel, cannot have been negligible.

The question of the influence of Aristophanic (Socratic) matter on *Ep. ad Coloss.* raises the inquiry as to whether there are any traces of the same thing in the related Epistle to the Ephesians. In the first place, is there a parallel section? To this there is an affirmative answer. The verses Eph $4^{15.16}$, which speak of the relation of the members of the body to the head and the consequent growth and increase of the body, are parallel to Col 2^{19}, where the same or similar statements are made. When we look at what precedes the Head-passage, with its growing and corresponding members, we see that it is not only Colossians that has the onslaught on philosophy. The same thing is true in Ephesians, where the Christian believers are advised against the fluctuations and the uncertainties of human teaching, and the tricks of teachers who are planning to deceive them. Thus we have an anti-philosophical warning in Ephesians also.

When we look more closely at the Ephesian text we see that the metaphor varies somewhat from that in the Colossian text. The victim of philosophy is not now up in the clouds, he is 'wave-tossed and wind-borne' (*κλυδωνιζόμενος καὶ περιφερόμενος ἀνέμῳ*), *i.e.* he is at sea. But there is still a fragment of the Socratic tradition in the text, for the word *περιφερόμενος* is the one used to describe the philosopher by the poet in Plato's *Apology*, where Socrates is said to be *περιφερόμενος* and to talk all sorts of fooling. The impression made on one's mind is that both Epistles have the same objection to philosophy, but that in Colossians the hostility is more specific, probably because the teachers that are attacked are more in evidence, and their teaching more strongly defined.

In either case philosophy is a form of deceit; in Colossians it is *κενὴ ἀπάτη* (2^{8}), 'idle or vain deceit': just before it is called *πιθανολογία*, 'the persuasive art.' In the same way, at the close of the play of Aristophanes, Strepsiades declares that 'Socrates and Chærephon have utterly deceived us' (*ἐξηπάτων*). In Ephesians the same idea of deceit on the part of the teachers is involved, but a new figure is introduced, that of the dice-player. The person who touches philosophy has the dice loaded against him; he is the victim of *ἡ κυβεία τῶν ἀνθρώπων*.

Of these two modes of treatment of the un-

desirable philosopher the Colossian appears to be the earlier, and that in the Ephesians to be later and more general. The priority of the Colossians comes out in another detail. Here the philosophers are said to teach the cult of angels, and *not to hold the Head.* The reason for the latter clause lies in the play of Aristophanes where the clouds are the new deities, who (with Vortex and Chaos) have displaced Zeus. The Greek prologues bring out clearly this feature of the text: *e.g.* in the preface of Thomas Magister, 'Socrates deserts the customary gods and plans new divinities, Air and Clouds and such-like.' The non-holding to the Head in Colossians has its motive in the abandonment of Zeus. There is no such motive to be traced in Ephesians. Moreover, the conception of Christ as the Head is a part of the Colossian Christology; it goes back to the Wisdom doctrine of 1^{18}, where Christ is defined as the Head and the Beginning. Thus it was perfectly natural for the Epistle to the Colossians to speak of a displaced Head; it was not so obvious to introduce the idea in Ephesians. So we see the priority of the Colossian treatment. It is interesting to note how the introduction of the Aristophanic parallels has thrown light upon the perplexing problem of the interrelation of the two Epistles.

Literature.

DR. DENNEY.

A NEW volume of letters by the late Professor Denney, admirably edited by Professor Moffatt, is sure of a wide and warm welcome. It is the kind of book you read through at a sitting and then go back to from time to time to renew the first pleasure. The letters of well-known persons are often desperately disappointing. But this cannot be said of Dr. Denney's. His individuality was so strong that he seemed to mint himself in anything he said or wrote. His short speeches of five minutes were almost perfect of their kind, and even the briefest letter in this collection has something of the force and point that his self-expression always conveyed.

The main impression this correspondence leaves is one that is probably familiar to all who knew its author well. There were two Dr. Denneys. There was the critical, dogmatic, and intolerant Denney. His mind was one of the most powerful engaged in our time on theological questions, but at the same time with a narrowness in it. It is good to find a man who knows that he knows anything worth knowing. And Dr. Denney was generally sure of himself. But his judgments were sometimes singularly restricted. In one of these letters he writes of the Roman Church: 'there is nothing in it that is not artificial'; in another: 'the only reason for remembering Dante is that in his poetical passages he is the divinest of poets.' He could see nothing good in the Church's advocacy of social reform. We select these opinions because they deal with great names or great causes, but his attitude in regard to them was characteristic of his mind. He saw clearly and deeply but not always widely, and this fact, while it often makes the letters piquant and arresting, detracts somewhat from the value of the writer's opinions.

But there was another Denney, as real and as interesting, the broad, human, tolerant observer of life. Dr. Moffatt quotes in his Introduction a sentence of Dr. Denney's criticism of Professor Drummond's book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World,* which is as characteristic of its writer as any of his dogmatic utterances: 'Christ is life: yes, and light and truth and love and righteousness; and wherever these exist in the world, confessed or unconfessed, in Greek, in Jew, in Buddhist or Brahmin, there Christ is, and life and grace and God.' Could anything be broader than that? or than this, on the same subject: 'The Spiritual man is born when the natural man comes *to himself*'? This was the Denney who, in a company that was discussing Matthew Arnold's theology, could say: 'After all it is on the ethical plane we all meet.' This was the Denney of the kind heart, the lover of nature, the loyal friend. This too was the Denney who, on questions of criticism, was as broad as you like.

One might explain this apparent contradiction by supposing that Dr. Denney saw a thing so

intensely that for the moment he saw nothing else. At any rate there went with his clearness of vision a clearness of utterance and a vividness of phrase that make his letters a constant delight. He was himself impatient of obscurity in a writer. 'I saw the *Times* on Meredith as a poet,' he writes, 'and read the illustrations of his style with silent wonder —after Homer! [He had just been reading the *Iliad*.] People may say what they like about thought, but a poet, as Emerson put it, is a man who can say what he wants to say; if he cannot say it, he is not a poet, no matter how much he may stimulate a *Times* critic to guess what was in his mind and to say it for him. Homer for ever, I say!' Admirers of Meredith's poetry would probably say this is an example of Dr. Denney's narrowness! And sympathizers with Spiritualism would say the same of his opinion on that subject. 'I wonder it never occurs to such people that you *cannot* believe in immortality unless you first believe in something which deserves to be immortal; and that to try to convince people of immortality by exhibiting the ongoings of "Katie King" when the gas is turned down and the magnesium light is on—ongoings which deserve nothing but instant extinction—is not a hopeful process. There is something horrible and even loathsome in the stupidity of it.' Imagination fails to realize what Gifford Lecturers will think of the little note in which Dr. Denney hits them off. 'It is too much to have a succession of philosophical persons getting up the ABC of religion *ad hoc*, and stammering through it before the public to the tune of £800 per annum or so. But I suppose it will go on till it is stopped. If a lecturer has an honorarium he can do without an audience.' There are not many passages in the letters with so much spice in them as that, but the mental pleasure of seeing a definite opinion expressed in vivid and apt language is one to be enjoyed continually in the perusal of these letters.

After all, however, the final impression this book leaves on us is of sorrow that Scotland, and especially the Scottish Church, has lost from her service here one who was at the same time a powerful thinker and a simple and devoted Christian. 'I haven't the faintest interest in any theology,' he writes, 'which doesn't help us to evangelize,' and, in a deeper note, 'what makes me even the kind of Christian I am is that I dare not turn my back on Jesus and put Him out of my life.' This is characteristic, because it is an expression of the loyalty which was the moral and spiritual core of the man. We are grateful for this unstudied portrait of him, done with repeated touches, by himself. And a word of warm appreciation is due to Dr. Moffatt for his work as editor. The title is *Letters of Principal James Denney to his Family and Friends.* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net.)

THE BELOVED DISCIPLE.

The title of Principal Garvie's book, *The Beloved Disciple* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.), is somewhat of a misnomer. It is not a character study, as one might expect, but contains a series of critical studies of the Fourth Gospel, its 'mode of composition, characteristics, purpose and authorship.' So much has been written on these topics that one takes up the book wondering if anything fresh remains to be said. Dr. Garvie, however, has worked over the whole field with extraordinary care, patience, and reverent scholarship, and has produced what bids fair to be a standard work.

Writing recently of the discovery of the Athenian Constitution, which upset so many historic reconstructions, Sir F. G. Kenyon says: 'It tends to make us almost sceptical as to the value of most conjectural restorations of historic facts, either in Greek or in Hebrew history. So many evidently reasonable theories and conjectures are scattered to the winds by these discoveries, that reasonable caution is imposed in accepting similar plausible imaginations for the future.' What would one not give for half a sheet of papyrus telling when and by whom the Fourth Gospel was written! How many 'reasonable theories and conjectures' would it scatter to the winds?

Meantime no safer guide through the intricacies of the problem can be found than Dr. Garvie. After a careful analysis of the Gospel he reaches the conclusion that the main narrative contains the 'reminiscences and reflexions' of an eye-witness, written out by the hand of a younger, scholarly disciple, here called the Evangelist, to whom is to be ascribed the Prologue. Further, it is argued that certain 'Synoptic elements are due to a redactor, and bear the marks of insertions interrupting the context.'

In considering who the original witness was, Dr. Garvie finds that he 'can go with Bishop Westcott entirely in the first three steps of his argument,

i.e. that the author was a Jew, a Jew of Palestine, and an eye-witness.' He does not consider that the evidence warrants the fourth step of Westcott's argument, that the author was the Apostle John. Rather he appears to have been a Jew of Jerusalem, a beloved disciple and close friend of the Master, who accompanied Him in Judæa, but not in Galilee, and whose narrative dealt only with incidents of which he had personal knowledge. This theory Dr. Garvie works out with great persuasiveness.

It will thus be apparent that Dr. Garvie lays the utmost stress upon the historic character of the beloved disciple's testimony. In this respect he is profoundly at variance with the standpoint of writers like Professor E. F. Scott and Dr. Strachan to whom the Gospel is primarily a theological treatise. Such views Dr. Garvie finds 'too ingenious and altogether unconvincing.' He cannot 'understand how it can be of no interest to Christian piety whether Jesus was or was not as the Gospel represents Him, whether He spoke, did, and suffered as He is represented.' His book is offered 'in the hope that it will contribute to a firmer assurance regarding the historical as well as the theological and ethical value of the Gospel, as he holds strongly the conviction that the Christian faith has its unshaken foundation, not in religious ideas and moral ideals, but in historical facts, in the historical personality, by whom God is revealed, and man redeemed, the Son who makes the Father known that men may find eternal life in Him.'

PUBLIC OPINION.

Mr. Walter Lippmann has written another book, *Public Opinion* (Allen & Unwin, Ltd.). It is an unusual kind of book, by an unusual kind of mind, which deals with masses of live and interesting things. And yet one has the feeling that, somehow, the book itself is not, perhaps, just quite as interesting as it very nearly is, partly because so many of its illustrations are drawn from American politics, which, frankly, other nations find a little provincial and boring. Yet the book is full of matter, and reveals a mind of independent judgment, teasing at pertinent problems upon every page, and indefatigably probing beneath the surface of many things that most of us dully take for granted without thought as just what happens.

The starting-point is Plato's cave, and it is laid down as the central fact that we still see, not things, but only their shadows cast upon our minds; or, as he puts it, that we each have a series of pictures of things in our head, which pictures do not correspond with accuracy to the realities around us. In the autumn of 1914 in an island six weeks from news, Englishmen, French, and Germans lived for that time in amity, the picture in their heads being that they were friends, whereas really they were enemies. That is a simple illustration. But the thing colours everything. We laugh at the impossible pictures of the world formed by the old geographers, but our own of everything are undependable and crude, even as theirs; our hero-worship, our dislikes, conjure up a being that is not the actual individual that really lives and acts.

These inaccurate pictures are sometimes deliberately manufactured for us by interested persons, and here our author, in his daundering way, strolls among such questions as the making of war communiques, the subtleties of the politicians, the newspaper, its function and office, and the like. Partly they are inevitable, for these counters we throw at each other and call words have not the same value and meaning to any two minds.

Moreover, we have no time for thinking, as it should be done.

In these conditions what are we to do? What we have done, it seems, is to form in our minds certain 'stereotypes,' of things and people, like the conventional villain of melodrama, who is recognizable at a first glance, and needs no label. And these, it seems, we use even unconsciously, in our reports of matters of which we have been spectators, which often are quite unreliable on this account. All those who were at the front will agree to the truth of this, and remember how many different reports of the manner of a man's death one could collect from actual eye-witnesses of it.

Public opinion, then, is made up in this curious way, and, says Mr. Lippmann, the dreams of the older democrats largely fizzled out because they had not grasped this basal fact that the pictures in the people's heads were no true representation of the actual facts.

CHRIST AND COLOSSE.

Dr. Cowen is the Professor of Oriental Languages at Washington, but he keeps his eyes upon our modern western world. He perceives, and truly, that to many who 'are most familiar with the letter

of the New Testament epistles,' the real message is obscured and lost; and that the ordinary commentary is not always helpful, is so minute and detailed that one cannot see the wood for the trees, which probably is even truer. And so, in *Christ and Colosse* (Skeffingtons; pp. 127)—five lectures, originally delivered at the Summer Schools of Portland and Victoria—he fastens upon what he takes to be the crown of Paul's teaching, and sweeps us through the great Epistle, with a width of outlook, and a rush of movement, and many a happy illustration drawn from art and literature, especially the modern poets, such as Tagore, an obvious favourite. Here is a characteristic sentence, from which one may fairly judge the whole. 'As in some Italian picture gallery where the mirror on the floor enables you to study the fresco on the ceiling, the revelation of Christ makes it possible for man to see what would otherwise be beyond all human vision.'

BELIEF IN CHRIST.

Since Bishop Gore retired from the Episcopate he has devoted his leisure to an important task which he calls 'The Reconstruction of Belief.' The first-fruits of this industry have already appeared in the shape of a volume on 'Belief in God,' which has been widely read and cordially approved as an important and timely contribution to the defence of Faith. Dr. Gore has now completed the second part of his task in the volume just issued on *Belief in Christ* (John Murray; 7s. 6d. net), and the series is to be completed by a third volume on the Church, in which the whole question of authority will be discussed. Obviously the second stage of the argument is the most important of the three, and the distinguished writer has expended on it all his great powers. He has been successful, we think, in his aim, which is nothing less than the defence of the traditional conception of the Person of Christ, the conception which finds expression in the decisions of the Councils. These decisions, Dr. Gore thinks, although their chief use is to warn men away from false ideas, really added nothing to the New Testament faith, and it is this faith in its fulness, in the highest reach of statement in St. Paul and St. John, that Dr. Gore wishes to establish.

He is successful; and his book reveals a powerful, earnest, and believing mind engaged on the greatest of religious questions. And yet there are qualifications. For one, the argument suffers from the fact that the basis of it is to be sought in the previous volume. Everything relevant in this book depends on the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel records, and this was (rather curiously) assigned to the first part of the argument dealing with 'Belief in God.' The present volume suffers from the want of a proper foundation. Another criticism will probably occur to many readers, especially those who are not theologians—there is too much in the book. There are chapters on the Doctrine of the Trinity, on Sin and the Fall, and on the Atonement. They are both valuable and interesting in themselves, and Dr. Gore's plea is that these matters are involved in belief in Christ in the fullest sense. He is probably right, but so are other matters which are not discussed here, *e.g.* faith in a future life. But the point is that the main argument is not sufficiently isolated just because there is so much matter and so many subjects reviewed. And these subjects will seem to many not really involved in the Christian belief in Christ, or, if 'involved' in it, yet not necessarily to be handled in an argument that is apologetic. It seems to us that the book would have been more effective for its purpose if the more theological elements had been gathered into another volume. In this respect it compares unfavourably with Dr. Denney's *Jesus and the Gospels*, where the aim of producing faith in Jesus Christ Himself is pursued with a singleness of purpose and treatment that is extraordinarily effective.

When these qualifications have been stated, it must be gratefully acknowledged that Dr. Gore has made a notable contribution to Christian apologetics. He begins with the Jewish background and thereafter proceeds to trace with sure skill the growth of faith in Jesus in the Gospels, a faith which was at first undefined and later was overthrown by the scandal of the Cross, but grew steadily and was re-established by the experience of the Resurrection. Belief, under the influence of the Spirit, blossomed into the enthusiastic conviction that Jesus was the Lord of all, appointed to be the final Judge of quick and dead. This faith, which might have seemed to be moving towards the deification of the man Jesus, was interpreted to the Church by St. Paul in the light of the title Jesus applied to Himself, Son of God; and this interpretation was welcomed in all the young churches

without controversy as the natural expression for their own experience. The fullest and most deliberate statement of this doctrine of Incarnation is found in the Fourth Gospel, but the other New Testament writers all concur in it.

Dr. Gore raises the question: Is the Incarnation the only sufficient account of the facts? He deals with the constructions of Harnack, Schweitzer, and Bousset, who present rival interpretations, and points out that they each have to rewrite the history in an arbitrary manner and that their theories really cancel each other. The decisive facts on which the author insists with convincing power are these—the self-consciousness of Jesus, the adoration of the disciples, and (a pertinent and original suggestion) the fact that the doctrine of Incarnation is the accepted tradition implied by the earliest sub-apostolic writers *before the Church possessed a New Testament.* The real source of the Faith of the disciples was the impression made by Jesus on them which grew into worship. It is in this experience, illuminated by the words of Jesus, that the New Testament is rooted and nothing else. The facts, in short, account for the belief, and the belief alone interprets the facts. This is Dr. Gore's argument, and it is expounded with characteristic clearness and cogency.

The rest of the book traces the later development of the doctrine of Christ's person, and considers the claims to belief of doctrines which are implied in the catholic interpretation of Christian experience. This part of the argument is able and persuasive, but it does not possess the intense and sustained interest of the earlier part. And we turn gratefully to the closing pages in which the main conclusion is reviewed. The view we must take of Christ, Dr. Gore says, is best expressed in the word *uniqueness* or *finality*, and nothing but the doctrine of 'the Word made flesh,' he insists, can justify the ascription of such a quality to Him. Dr. Gore has put the Church under a heavy debt of gratitude for the way in which he has brought all his great resources to bear on this point. This is the strength of his book, and the deep and passionate earnestness with which it is enforced gives to the book a singular charm.

THE MOST POPULAR OF THE GOSPELS.

Which is the Gospel that has gripped the mind and heart of men most closely? Which is the one that we could least afford to lose? Most would probably say John; Ruskin thought Matthew; Renan, Luke; and Dora Greenwell, Mark. But there is another that has played an even greater part—the Gospel according to Christ's enemies! Think it out and you will see that it is it that brings our Lord most vividly before us, that makes Him most lovable to us, and on which we most depend. It is the bitter jibes they threw at Him that have become His chief glory, the taunts and scoffs of hostile lips that we all feel best sum up for us what He really is. It was an enemy that first hinted with a sneer that He was the friend of publicans and sinners; it was with laughter as at an absurd jest that they decked Him in the purple, hailed Him as the 'King'; it was flung at Him as a jeer that 'He saved others, but could not save Himself.' It is the Gospel of His enemies that is most thumbed, and quotations from it that are oftenest repeated.

Well, Dr. James Snowden has written a book which he calls *Jesus as Judged by His Enemies* (Abingdon Press; pp. 246), in which he deals with some sections of it; for he says that there are more than sixty of such scattered through the Gospels.

LIBERALISM, MODERNISM, AND TRADITION.

Any one who desires a clear view of present-day tendencies in Christian thinking could not do better than read the Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1922, which have been published under the title *Liberalism, Modernism, and Tradition*, by the Rev. O. C. Quick, M.A., Canon of Newcastle (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). The book deals with the big questions, but Canon Quick writes with such ease, such mastery, such simplicity, and his own thought is so free from vagueness or obscurity, that the lectures are a sheer pleasure to read. The aim which the writer set before himself may be stated in his own words: 'I have endeavoured to define the essential values which a [true] Christology must preserve, rather than even to indicate any theory which would be capable of preserving them. . . . All theology is fundamentally orthodox which is built upon the Christian experience of God through Christ. . . . We must therefore make clear some measure of agreement as to the immediate empirical meaning, which is also the limitation, of Christianity, before we can expect our Christologies to expand it by their mediation. Modernism, where it is

unorthodox, is not unorthodox because it restates Christianity, but because it states something which is not Christian. . . . But what is Christianity? That is the first question. What I have chiefly sought to do, is neither to restate nor state any Christology, but to define the empirical data of Christianity from which all Christologies should start.' The writer is too modest. His book contains a great deal more than this. It contains a searching criticism of Protestant Liberalism, of Modernism in its religious and philosophical forms and of Traditional theology. After this analysis the book proceeds to sketch the essentials of the Christian faith so far as they may contribute to a doctrine of the Person of Christ. And finally, there is the writer's own construction, or suggestions towards a construction, of a Christology which will be true to the best in tradition and free from the defects which render the modern world impatient of the older formula.

The most interesting, and in some ways the most valuable, part of these lectures is the critical part, in which the writer subjects the Liberalism of Rashdall and Glover, as well as the system of Ritschl, the father of the school, to a most enlightening analysis. The Modernism of Loisy and Caird enjoys the same radical treatment. The writer is perfectly fair, and even sympathetic, but few of the weak points of either system escape him. These chapters are informative as well as interesting, and they serve as a necessary introduction to the positive part of the inquiry where the writer asks and answers the question: what is essential Christianity? and then proceeds with his own thoughts as to how the facts of Christian history and experience are to be built into an edifice of constructive thought which will be wind-and-water tight. Canon Quick reveals in this book not only a wide knowledge of the relevant literature, but unusual powers of independent thought.

THE DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE OF SCOTLAND.

Dr. Philip, the ex-Moderator of the United Free Church, has built up a little book round the Murtle Lecture which he delivered to the University of Aberdeen. He calls it *The Devotional Literature of Scotland* (James Clarke; 5s.). It is always well when a fine subject and the man to whom it falls by divine right happen to come together. Dr. Philip's scholarly mind is steeped in his theme, and his own devoutness fits him, peculiarly, to write with sympathetic understanding of those so near of kin to his own spirit. And they form a goodly fellowship. Yet Dr. Philip writes of them, not only with a hot affection and enthusiasm, but with a characteristically sane and sober judgment. Within the first score of spiritual classics, he says, 'there may not be many, or any, Scottish books. No Scottish work is ethereal and influential as the Imitation, none is so steadily thrilling as Bunyan, none in mere style is gorgeous, and in that sense appealing, as Jeremy Taylor, none is comparable in beauty with the English Prayer Book.' And that is true. Among all these names that move the heart, is there one that attains unquestionably to the first rank? Guthrie of Fenwick is too curt, Rutherford too passionate for certain tastes, Leighton too stiffly brocaded with quotation, Chalmers too wordy; Fraser of Brea and Halyburton have a certain haunting vividness of phrasing but not style, and where that style exists, and that almost to perfection, as in Boston and the others from whom Stevenson admitted that he learned his art, a certain brooding over-anxious introspection is apt to become almost morbid and unhealthy. No, in the first score there is not one Scottish book. And yet how glorious a heritage it is, and how immeasurably far, as Dr. Philip shows, its influence has spread! One note of criticism: the quotations given here, sound though they are, strike one as not the best or the most characteristic possible, not those that Dr. Whyte would have been sure to cull. Yet this is a fine little book, worthy of a place not far from that of Dr. Walker of Carnwath.

ANTONIO FOGAZZARO.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published the English translation of *The Life of Antonio Fogazzaro*, by Tommaso Gallarati-Scotti. The work was planned and nearly finished before the war, and the author was for a time in doubt whether there was room for its publication in the changed world which is emerging from that great upheaval. He has decided rightly that it contains a human experience so rich as to be of enduring value, and the biography is issued as 'an earnest invitation to revert to the things of the inner life.'

It is not to be expected that this work will excite

the popular interest it would have done in the days when *The Saint* took the literary and religious world by storm, and when Abbé Loisy and the Pascendi were in every mouth. None the less it has permanent value, not merely as the record of a noble life nobly written, but as the history of a poetical and mystic soul, tossed on the troubled waters of those bitter years when the nineteenth century was struggling to readjust its thinking to the revolutionary concept of Evolution.

Fogazarro came of a race of mountaineers, and the love of the hills, as he said, was in his blood. Better still, his family belonged to the finest type of Italian Catholics, and religion profoundly influenced him. Elements of contradiction entered into his experience which made his spiritual life a ceaseless struggle, and brought it at last to a tragic close. He was torn between his loyalty to the Papal chair, and to the cause of Italy. A devout Romanist, he had yet a mind hospitable to the modern scientific outlook. His sympathies were with Modernism until its deepening tone of rationalism alienated him from the movement. For a time he cherished warm hopes of a liberal revival within the Church. His views on reform he set forth in his great novel *The Saint*. When the inevitable condemnation followed, Fogazzaro felt it his duty to bow to authority, and thus he was thrown into a dubious position which exposed him to the bitter attacks of both radicals and reactionaries. This cast a deep shadow over his closing years, and the story reminds one of the tragedy of his friend Father Tyrrell.

On his death-bed he said with tears, 'My Modernism consisted only in this, that it was my heart's desire to see great intellects overflowing with charity raised to high places in the Church, that the world might be flooded with the light of Christianity.' It is well that a record should be preserved of this rare and beautiful, though much tried, soul.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Under our present economic system unemployment is a more or less constant fact. There are, however, cycles of trade depression when it becomes acute and the problems connected with it become urgent. To-day, as every one knows, it is *the* pressing public question, and anybody who has any contribution to make towards its solution is sure of a hearing. This fact makes Mr. J. A. Hobson's latest book welcome, especially as he has made this field peculiarly his own. The title is *The Economics of Unemployment* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). The present depression, which has thrown multitudes out of work, is sufficiently accounted for in the minds of many by the War, with its destruction of capital resources and the confusion into which it has thrown the financial system, and all the other complications that have gone along with these results. Mr. Hobson, however, regards this explanation as unsound. These influences have undoubtedly aggravated the evil; they have not produced it. The real cause is something different. Under a healthy system production and consumption will as nearly as possible balance one another. When there is over-production or under-consumption, there is a glut, and unemployment results. But this result is produced by an excessive proportion of income being applied to capital purposes, or by the accumulation of large sums of money which are not even used for luxury or show. In this way production is applied to increases of plant and other 'capital goods' in excess of what is needed to furnish 'consumable goods.' The real remedy is to stimulate consumption; and this can be done only by the removal of the surplus elements in large incomes which brought about the disproportion. This would involve no hardship, because the stimulation of consumption would lead to an increase of industrial capital as large as heretofore. And the incentives to enterprise would not be interfered with. The aggravations of the present distress probably demand emergency measures, but the remedy just indicated is the only certain cure of the disease.

The backbone of Mr. Hobson's policy is our new and winsome friend the 'Capital Levy.' If any one objects that this would kill the goose that lays the golden egg, the reply would be that, on the contrary, the stimulation of consumption consequent on the transfer of money to the poorer classes would in its turn create a bigger demand for goods and so lead to an actual increase of industrial capital. It is only fair to say that in an interesting chapter Mr. Hobson faces and answers the most obvious objections to his argument. There will be different opinions as to the force of his answer. But there can be no question as to the earnestness and the ability with which Mr. Hobson stands up to an economic evil of the first magnitude.

There is a passion in his writing which shows how deeply he feels the human urgency of the problem; and in his hands, though his book needs careful attention, the 'dismal science' loses its dulness and we are carried on with unflagging interest to the close of the argument.

A BOOK FOR MISSIONARIES TO THE BUDDHISTS.

Dr. Whyte used to beseech his classes on an average once a fortnight or thereby to sell their beds to get this or that other book he was commending! If any one is going as a missionary to a Buddhist country, even that sacrifice is not too great whereby to secure the books of Mr. Kenneth Saunders (though happily their trifling price puts them in everybody's reach) for they will go far to teach him the mental language he needs for his lifework. Here is another of the rapidly increasing number, *Buddhism in the Modern World* (S.P.C.K.; 3s.), marked by the now familiar characteristics —the generous catholicity, the reverent mind that hears God speaking through the prophets of all the august faiths, the humble devotion to Jesus Christ, the happy expectancy that knows that we western peoples have not exhausted Him, and that the eastern world, when won, will vastly enrich the common Christianity, the sympathy that puts one into touch at once with those trained in this other creed and atmosphere. Mr. Saunders leads us through what to him is very familiar ground, the various Buddhist countries in which he himself has lived so long, and shows us how that faith is working out to-day. Upon the whole it is a fine record, which must make the coming missionary feel that he is going to a people worth the winning. In a rapid series of vivid vignettes we are shown the people's life,—in Burmah among whose happy folk more men are literate than in Italy, in Ceylon where a constant shadow seems to lie in spite of all the sunshine, in Siam, in China, in Japan, their services, their schools, the joy of their funerals, the things and the figures in Christianity that appeal to them, Tolstoy, *e.g.*, the movements of the present day Buddhist mind, their passing here and there from the old proud self-sufficiency, their sense of the need of a Saviour, the almost unbelievable approximating of their doctrines to the Christian faith,—in short the very things the future missionary needs to know, and with a little list of books to carry him still further. Undoubtedly his bed will have to go, rather than that he should miss this.

Selfmastery through Conscious Auto-Suggestion (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net) is a short account of the method of the practice of Auto-suggestion, written by M. Coué. It contains also a survey of séances, and some letters from patients. 'Day by day, in every way, I am getting better and better'; 'make this auto-suggestion,' says M. Coué, 'with the certainty of obtaining what you want. The greater the conviction the greater and more rapid will be the results obtained.' But there are those who have difficulty with the 'certainty.'

The 118th Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1s. net) is a marvellous record. It is not merely that the income is nearly £50,000 above last year's, and the issue of Scriptures correspondingly increased. What thrills the reader is the amazing panorama of kingdoms and peoples and tribes among whom the agents of the Society work and to whom it is continually supplying the Word of God. It is the most extensive and magnificent propaganda in the world. The student of international politics will find much interesting information about Central Europe and the Near East.

The Cambridge University Press have added to their Pitt Press Series *Sir Thomas Browne: Hydriotaphia* (3s. 6d.). It is edited by Mr. W. Murison, M.A., Senior English Master in the Aberdeen Grammar School, and that is sufficient to guarantee the interest and accuracy of the Introduction and Notes.

Dr. J. H. Jowett has published a volume of sermons with the title *God our Contemporary* (James Clarke; 6s. net). The title gives the idea that runs through all the sermons. God is not out of date. He is competent to-day to clear away all perplexities of the soul, to solve all our pressing problems. Only 'in the fuller reception of God's grace, and in the more mature understanding of His will can they be cleared away or solved.' 'Jesus Christ the same . . . to-day.' The sermons are original and most suggestive. Are they not by Dr. Jowett?

'An elementary study' is how Mr. Chapman

describes his little book, *The Consciousness of Jesus* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d.). And so it is. And yet 'would to God,' cried Moses, 'that all the people were God's prophets'; and it were well indeed that all our laymen had as close an interest in the big things that matter, and as reverent a mind, and as happy a knack of setting down the outcome of their studies in simple and straightforward language that no one can fail to understand, as Mr. Chapman has shown here. We cannot have too many proofs that it is possible to talk theology in untheological language, as indeed the Master did in His own day. For, now as then, people, tired of the jargon of the schools, are quick to turn with gratitude to the gospel when translated into their own ordinary speech.

In *Won by Blood* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), Mr. A. K. Langridge tells the story of Erromanga, the Martyr Isle. The story is a familiar one in the annals of South Sea Missions, but it is well that it should be retold, for it is not only an inspiring record of Christian heroism, but an impressive chapter of Christian evidence. The narrative is graphic, and in a concluding chapter the writer deals with the pressing problem of the depopulation of the islands.

Sunlit Hopes, by the Rev. James Woodside Robinson, B.A. (James Clarke; 6s. net), is a volume of sermons. The sermons are short, and the thought clothed in gracious language. The first is typical. It is called the Scent of the Roses. 'It is a long, long time ago,' Mr. Robinson begins, 'since they laid Him in that grave among the flowers, but Life never changes and Death is just the same.'

The points are: '1. In the labyrinth of human life there is always a *Garden*. It is not always cultivated, nor planted, nor covered with flowers, nor tenanted with roses. Still it is there, and it should be the glory of young hands to cultivate and plant it and bring forward its growth to perfection.'

'2. In the windings of human life there is always a *Cross*. The best dramatists and poets and novelists and preachers write of it, and they and all philosophers say that men are not true men, nor women real women, till they have felt the wound-prints of pain, and have known at least a little of the suffering of the thorn spikes of Calvary.'

'3. In the evolution of human life there is always a *Sepulchre*. It is a frightful thing to see nothing but the grave, where love and grief lie bleeding, when there is no hope beyond.' But to the Christian '*Death* is like the bell of evening calling the weary workers home.'

Leave them with God!
Love's arms are His,
And 'tis
His Love and Thought in us
That bids us dare
To lay them in His arms
And leave them there.

'Midst Volcanic Fires, by Maurice Frater (James Clarke; 6s. net), is an account of missionary tours among the volcanic islands of the New Hebrides. It opens with a graphic description of the great eruption in Ambrim in December 1913, of which the writer was an eye-witness. The main subject of the book is the progress of Christianity in the islands. The trials and triumphs of the work are vividly pictured, and there are many striking contrasts of saints and savages, sunshine and shadow, tears and laughter. The author is a missionary of the John G. Paton Mission Fund, and his book is a worthy sequel to the romantic writings of the great pioneer himself.

The swing of the pendulum to-day is towards pastoral evangelism. There will always be room in the Church for the special evangelist, but the feeling prevails that evangelism has been over-organized. In America the Churches have begun to look askance at gigantic missions. In England the voice of John Clifford has been recalling us to the simpler methods of the New Testament.

Every true preacher covets to do the work of an evangelist. But how? Some may have read again their Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, if not to copy its methods, at least to catch the inspiration of its spirit.

Do you wish a modern version of Baxter? Then read *Pastor and Evangelist*, by Charles L. Goddell, D.D. (Doran; $1.35). It should be in every minister's hands. It is a golden little book.

There is nothing more telling in religious teaching than a good story, but it is not always easy to get one. Here, then, is treasure-trove for the teacher and the preacher in a new book by Mrs. Eggleston,

Stories for Special Days in the Church School (New York: George H. Doran; $1.25). Mrs. Eggleston is an old hand at telling stories and an expert in the art. She proves this in her preface by one remark. She is giving advice on the use of the story, and her advice is: 'Learn to live the story.' She goes into useful detail, but that remark contains the whole philosophy of story-telling. The stories contained in this book have been tested by the writer and found successful. They seem to us excellently adapted to their purpose, and we commend the book to teachers as one certain to provide them with good illustrations. But we advise them to study the preface before they use them.

The daughter of Dr. Talmage has selected about four hundred thoughts and illustrations from her father's sermons and arranged them alphabetically. They will be welcomed by the admirers of Dr. Talmage. The title of the book is *The Wisdom and Wit of T. De Witt Talmage*, selected by May Talmage (Doran; $1.50).

In the United States of America men in business are said to be 'hustlers,' and among the ministers of all religious denominations there 'hustlers' are also to be found. In *How to make the Church Go* (Doran), the Rev. W. H. Leach takes the position that 'the task of the modern pastor is to put the entire church at work building the Kingdom of God.' He argues that 'it is better to put ten men to work than to do ten men's work,' and that 'a happy church is a church of workers.' There is the conspicuous example of Dr. Chalmers in his big Glasgow parish, though Mr. Leach is evidently not aware of it, where he succeeded in establishing by means of his church workers the most successful system of poor relief that has ever been tried in this country, for it succeeded in virtually abolishing the poor. And yet when his controlling influence was withdrawn the system ended in failure.

There is much that is commonplace in Mr. Leach's suggestions. At the same time he writes from a wide experience as a modern minister of an American congregation with its varied activities.

The Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, Dr. Maldwyn Hughes, has published, through the Epworth Press, a study of *The Kingdom of Heaven* (3s. 6d. net). His aim has been practical, to help those who are engaged in preaching to a better understanding of the central message of our Lord's ministry. It is a thorough and scholarly piece of work, ranging from the prophetic and apocryphal preparation on the one side to the Pauline and Johannine interpretations on the other. The author's main strength, however, is given to the Gospels, and none of the questions raised by the teaching and self-consciousness of Jesus is overlooked. What did Jesus think of Himself? Is the Kingdom present or future — purely inward and spiritual, or social as well? Does the Parousia mean the visible reign of Christ on earth? And did Jesus really expect and teach that He would come again within the lifetime of the current generation? In what sense was His ethic absolute, *e.g.*, the world-renouncing element in it? What is the significance of the Cross in the fulfilment of the Kingdom? These are some of the questions raised and answered in this interesting study. The answers are for the most part on conservative lines, but other answers are reviewed; and if the author is never startlingly original he has a sound judgment, and is able to give good reasons for the faith that is in him. It is significant that in a volume which would be pronounced 'sound' the 'objective' theory of the Atonement is set aside. The reconciliation of men to God is accomplished in the Cross by two things, (1) by a life of complete obedience to the divine will lived by One who shared our human nature, and (2) by a supreme manifestation on the field of history of God's hostility to sin and love for the sinner. These points are well developed and set in the light of the language used by Jesus and also by St. Paul. It may be said of the whole volume, that preachers will find in it both intellectual guidance and a great deal of useful suggestion for the best kind of pulpit work.

Principal Jacks, the editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, delivered two lectures in various towns in England in the spring of this year at the invitation of the Hibbert Trustees. He has expanded these into a 'little book' and published them with the title *Religious Perplexities* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). There are three chapters dealing with The Source of Perplexity, Religious Perplexity in General, and Perplexity in the Christian Religion. There is a moving earnestness and an elevation of spirit throughout the book which will do a great deal of themselves to help honest inquirers. But

Principal Jacks has a point of view of his own, and it is this point of view which is his real contribution to perplexed souls. Our despairs, he says, arise from a cowardly attitude to life. Religion does not remove perplexity, but braces us to meet it. There is much that is bewildering in the world. But there is something else. There is in us a spirit that can go out heroically to meet difficulty and conquer it. When a soul adopts this attitude it is met more than half-way by the Great Companion, and finds its own assurance of the friendliness of the universe. Religion often suffers from over-defence and over-explanation. Let us but act on it and it will bring its own peace and reveal its own certainty.

In all this many readers will go all the way with the writer and thank him for it. Some of them will find the closing chapter a little thin and vague. Dr. Jacks thinks that perplexities about Christianity are nothing else than the entanglements which an originally simple faith contracted in various directions. He therefore goes back to the primitive documents to discover what the Christian religion was. There is no perplexity about it at all. It is a very simple, though a very difficult, religion indeed. In beautiful language he describes the attitude of Jesus to God and the world, and commends this to us for our imitation. In spite of his persuasiveness, however, his exposition leaves us wondering how, if this was all, such a message turned the world upside down.

Do the young people of this generation know the romantic story of Khama? It is nearly thirty years since he took England by storm when he came over to plead the cause of Bechuanaland. His life is a wonderful story of adventure and achievement. A very readable account of it is published under the title of *Khama, the Great African Chief*, by John Charles Harris (Livingstone Press; 1s. net).

A very interesting account of native life in Polynesia is given by V. A. Barradale in *Pearls of the Southern Seas* (Livingstone Press; 1s. net). Samoa's enthusiasm for cricket is surely a record, with teams of men and women numbering anything up to two hundred, matches lasting a fortnight or three weeks, and a continuous musical accompaniment from native drums and empty kerosene tins. So great did the nuisance become that the government was compelled to restrict the game to two days a week. For supporting this law the missionaries were 'pilloried as kill-joys, and accused of forbidding members and adherents of the churches to play cricket at all.' The book concludes with a short account of the work of the L.M.S. in the islands.

The Rev. Dr. J. Macbride Sterrett, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy in the George Washington University and a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, has published under the title *Modernism in Religion* (Macmillan; 6s. net) the story of his own spiritual progress 'to a haven that is not storm-tossed with doubt.' He looks back over a ministry within his own branch of the Christian Church extending over fifty years, but his pilgrimage towards Modernism has evidently not been so long. There has always been what has been termed Modernism, and of varying types. Dr. Sterrett defines it thus: 'Modernism stands for a new spirit and for modern methods in the study and teaching of religion and ethics. It does not offer a new set of dogmas, but it does ask for a modern interpretation of the older ones.' He deprecates any mutilation of the creeds, unless it be that of Athanasius, but suggests the following for use in presenting adults for confirmation: 'I believe in the Father of all; and in Jesus the revealer of God and the Saviour of men. I believe in the life-giving Spirit; in the fellowship of the children of God; in the forgiveness of sins: the victory of love is life eternal.'

To be absolutely impartial in writing history of any kind, but especially a history of Thought, is probably a task beyond human nature. Our own views colour more or less even our statement of facts, and certainly our statement of other people's views. But there have been cases known of men proving able to write sound historical surveys of Thought with a frankly declared propaganda aim. When such a writer clearly declares his polemical aim, it seems to make him very careful and accurate in stating the views which he is going to attack. Lewes wrote a History of Philosophy with the sole purpose of showing how futile were all theories but his own. Yet in many respects it was a good history.

So now we have A. K. Rogers writing *English and American Philosophy since 1800: A Critical Survey* (Macmillan; New York; $3.50), and in the

most charming manner telling us that the book is unashamedly propaganda, and that it is so largely critical just because he wanted to criticize. It is a trustworthy book for all that. Wherever we have tested it we have found it accurate. It is well balanced, clearly expressed, and well written. It will amaze most to find from the mere size of the book, in which not an otiose sentence occurs and not a word is superfluous—from the mere list of names of philosophical writers, and from the mere number of philosophical schools and movements that fall to be considered—that philosophy has been so very much alive, especially during the last few years.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published a volume of the sermons of the Rev. William Kirk Bryce of the Baptist Church, Bromley. The title, *Life's Greatest Forces*, is got from the first sermon, 'But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love.' We may quote from it: 'The three forces, Faith, Hope, and Love, are the hands of the soul. The body has only two, but the soul is very odd, having three strong limbs. Faith lays hold of Christ, grasping Him with a saving grip. Hope lays hold of Heaven, making sure of the many mansions, and the soul looks forward with joy to its eternal habitations: "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." Love lays hold upon men in order to serve them and bring them to God; as William Arnot says: "It will not, cannot, let the world alone; all the neighbours know it, feel it. Love is like Him who went about doing good."'

The sermons have all a strong evangelical note, and the variety of topics treated is considerable. The volume is published at the very reasonable price of 3s. 6d. net.

Are you on the outlook for a book for the Sunday-school library or the missionary work party. Then take this, *Daughters from Afar*, by Rose White (Partridge; 2s. 6d.). Missionary books in these days cannot afford to be dull, but this is a sheer delight in word-painting. The first third of the book tells of Miss White's Jubilee Home in Bangalore, of her girls, their characters and ways, their difficulties and discipline, their wooings and weddings. The rest of the book is occupied with three charming life-stories, full of human interest and told with the highest artistic skill.

It is a far cry from these early years of the twentieth century to the early years of the seventeenth century, when a young Swiss, Hans Jakob Ammann, a native of Thalwyl on the Lake of Zurich, made the journey from Vienna to Constantinople, thence by way of Damascus to Jerusalem, and then to Cairo and Alexandria, taking the Pyramids *en route*. A copy of the interesting narrative of his grand tour, elaborately and beautifully illustrated, has just been 'presented to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of Dr. James Hastings with the compliments of Aug. F. Ammann,' the descendant and kinsman of the traveller.

This handsome volume (*Hans-Jakob Ammann, genannt der Thalwyler Schärer, Reiss ins Globte Land*, published by the Polygraphisches Institut at Zurich; 40 frs.), with its peculiarly interesting narrative of the conditions in the Near East four hundred years ago, would have been most heartily welcomed by Dr. Hastings had he lived to receive it, both for its own merits and for the testimony, borne by him who has forwarded the gift, to the value of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

M. Aug. Ammann has obviously given infinite pains and skill to the work of editing and reproducing the writings of his ancestor. He has not only illustrated the volume with the best contemporary illustrations, but has otherwise enriched it with many valuable notes, a glossary, a bibliography, etc. It has been granted only to the very chief of writers to have their work handed down to the latest generations with such loving care and whole-hearted admiration.

The president of the National Kindergarten and Training College of the United States, Miss Elizabeth Harrison, has written a book on *The Unseen Side of Child Life* (R.T.S.; 5s. net). It is not her first book, or her second. She wrote one on the *Study of Child Nature*, which is now in its forty-fifth edition. It dealt with the influences of heredity in childhood. Her second essay had the power of environment for its subject. In the present volume she takes up the most difficult and the most important of the three factors which count in the life of a child, its will-power, or 'self-activity.' Miss Harrison is a deeply religious woman, as all who have the teaching of children in their hands

should be, and her standpoint throughout is frankly religious. There are two explanations of the unseen side of a child's life, the materialistic and the spiritual, and we have in this book an admirable exposition of the latter. Miss Harrison has many interesting and valuable things to say of the influences that train the will of a child, play, instinct, friendship, and much else. Her points are illustrated by many examples and incidents from her own experience, and her book will appeal to all who are charged with the care of young children, parents and teachers alike.

An admirable sketch of *Old Testament History* has been written by Dr. Frank Sanders, sometime Professor in Yale University, and published by Messrs. Scribner's Sons (New York; $1.25). It is the first of a series of volumes called 'Life and Religion Series.' The succeeding volumes will deal with the New Testament, the Historical Development of Christianity, the World Religions, Modern Missions, and other subjects. If they are as good as the first volume they will be indispensable to the teacher and not much less to the preacher. The idea of Dr. Sanders' book is excellent. The history is divided into periods, and the main incidents are outlined under each period. The contribution of each period is indicated, and the successive stages of ethical and religious development are clearly set forth. All relevant facts and influences are included, but the exposition is so carefully proportioned that the main outlines stand out plainly, and the student is able to grasp the whole in a true perspective. It would be a great gain if the ordinary layman could read this book. There are no technicalities in his way, and the writing is so clear and simple, and the printing and spacing so good, that the task would be easy for him. There are other features of this little book worthy of mention. The appendices furnish practical help to the teacher. One contains topics for discussion under each chapter. Another gives questions to test the reader's grasp of facts, while a third has a list of literature for further study. It only remains to say that the standpoint of the writer is cautious and yet modern. It is very much the standpoint of 'Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.'

In the 'Science of To-day Series' the latest volume is one on *Chemistry of To-day*, by G. P. Bull, M.A. (Seeley, Service & Co.; 8s. 6d. net). The object of this series is to furnish popularly written and up-to-date expositions of scientific knowledge which are free of dry formulæ and technicalities. There is no branch of science which has made greater advances than Chemistry, and the story Mr. Bull tells in this book has all the elements of romance in it. In *The Lighter Side of School Life*, Mr. Ian Hay says that in public schools of a former generation the main interest of the boys in what was called 'science' lay in the production of horrible smells and loud explosions; and the interest of the public was not much greater. But all that has changed, and to-day there is a widespread and eager desire to know all that scientific men have to tell us about the world in which we live. This curiosity will be amply satisfied in one direction by Mr. Bull's exposition which, if not exactly free of technicalities, is a lucidly written account of the facts disclosed by the wonderful discoveries of modern chemists. There are chapters on 'Matter and some of its Properties,' on 'the Air we breathe,' on 'the Romance of Radium' and 'the Wonders of the Spectroscope,' as well as a score of other equally fascinating themes. The book is profusely illustrated by over 150 diagrams and photographs and will be welcomed as a competent presentation in popular form of the 'mysteries' of modern chemistry.

An elaborate treatise on *Oratorical Style: Its Art and Science*, by a writer who appropriately enough chooses to be known as I. Demosthenes (Simpkin; 6s. net), is like a man born out of due season. But just because we have never had so many speakers in Parliament, on the platform and in the pulpit and yet so few orators, it may be the fit and proper time to seek to restore this lost art and science. The writer of this volume has devoted his intimate knowledge of the classics to the exposition of all the qualities and qualifications of those who aspire to become good speakers with a good delivery and a good style. He has compiled an embarrassment of riches in the form of the very best advice on every aspect of the subject. He has garnered in so many fields that the chief difficulty of the would-be orator will be to know just where he ought to begin.

The Bishop of London writes a foreword to Hilda Parham's latest book, *The Voice of Jesus* (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d. net). 'The great merit of this book,'

he says, 'is that it weaves Bible reading into the teaching of the Church and helps children to hear the voice of Jesus speaking to them as they read each short passage on their knees.' The volume contains 'Thoughts for Boys and Girls upon the Holy Gospels throughout the Christian Year.'

The publications of the Student Christian Movement are always fresh and breezy, and doubtless make a strong appeal to the manly and heroic in youth. Whether they deal adequately with the deep problems of sin and redemption is another matter. These qualities appear in *Our Faith in God through Jesus Christ*, by Professor J. Ernest Davey, B.D. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). The book expounds the Christian view of God as the writer understands it, in answer to four questions—Is it reasonable? Is it necessary? Is it effective? Is it final? Take this for breeziness, 'Will it not do if we are decent chaps? . . . to be a Christian is to be the most decent chap possible.' But surely when the writer goes on to say that 'Jesus Christ is the decentest chap we know of,' his language becomes offensive both to good taste and Christian feeling. It must be said, however, that, while one is conscious of the absence of some of the deeper and higher notes, the book is full of straightforward and healthy Christian teaching.

The S.P.C.K. publish a small volume of addresses by Bishop Weston of Zanzibar—*In His Will* (3s. 6d. net). These addresses were originally delivered to the Associates of the Community of the Sacred Passion in June 1914.

The Lesson of the Catacombs, published by the S.P.C.K. (2s. 6d. net), is a small booklet giving a short description of the Catacombs. It might well serve as an introduction to a fascinating page of the Church's history. The matter is arranged in chapters under such headings as Holy Baptism, Confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist, for it is the *lesson* of the Catacombs that is the subject.

'The scenery of the Old Testament is laid in three regions which may be roughly described as Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Palestine.' 'The whirligig of Time' has brought them quite as much to the forefront in the present welter of national and international problems. But the scenery of the Old Testament has that abiding and absorbing interest of 'far-off Divine events,' and certain aspects of these are dealt with in *Biblical Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia*, by the Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., F.R.G.S. (Elliot Stock; 4s. 6d. net). It is in a new and third edition, a sufficient testimony to the character of a work of this kind. Canon Girdlestone, who writes a foreword to the edition, says the book is really the result of lectures given to a summer school in connexion with the Jews Society. It is 'the work of a shrewd and honest observer who is zealous for the truth of the Bible.'

In 1916 the Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., F.R.G.S., delivered a course of Lectures at Swanwick to the summer school of the Church Missions to the Jews. These lectures are now published under the title of *New Testament Archæology* (Elliot Stock; 6s. net). The field covered is very wide, and little more than glimpses here and there can be given of the vast amount of research work that has been done. But it would be difficult to name a more interesting popular survey. It is well informed and thoroughly up to date. The student of the New Testament will find fresh light thrown on many familiar passages, and his confidence in the historicity of the records will be confirmed. A concluding chapter on the New Testament and Criticism gives a useful account of the real meaning and purpose of criticism, yet the author permits himself to speak at times of 'the critics' as if he shared the vulgar notion that they are all anti-Christian. A list of authorities is appended to each chapter, and the text is illustrated by sixteen exquisite photographs.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, and other Watchwords of the Faith, resounded by a Humble Ensign in the Great King's Army, has been issued by Mr. Elliot Stock (1s. 6d. net). There are about twenty-nine watchwords, and each one occupies a couple of pages.

Mrs. Sturge Gretton, J.P. for Oxfordshire, has issued through the Student Christian Movement seven essays with the title *Some English Rural Problems* (4s. net; in paper cover, 2s. 6d. net). She discusses the rural problem of the nineteenth century. 'Is the child,' asked the hand-loom weaver in Gloucestershire in 1882, 'to be kept at school till nine years of age, and, if so, who is to

pay for it?' The standard of the Education Acts to-day is somewhat different. We begin to feel self-satisfied with the progress made. But Mrs. Gretton will not allow us to go away with this feeling.

There is a rural problem to-day. Revolutionary talk is abroad now in the country as well as in the towns. And Mrs. Gretton traces it largely to the abolition of the Wages Boards. Whatever the cause, the subject is one which deserves consideration.

The Report of the General Committee of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland for 1921–22 has just been issued from the Student Christian Movement Press (6d. net) under the title *Christianity and the Colleges*. It is a good fat pamphlet of a hundred pages and contains all the information that 'Student movers' and their friends could ask for. The whole work of the movement is described in all its aspects—the study work, the campaigns, the missionary activities, the university propaganda, and much else. There is a financial statement, and there are special chapters on specially important topics, such as 'Students and the Church.'

Religion and Biology, by Ernest E. Unwin, M.Sc. (Swarthmore Press; 6s. net), deals with the biological approach to the problems of religious thought, especially with those concerning God in Nature. It is a competent survey of a wide field. The drama of life is briefly sketched according to the evolutionary concept, and the end and purpose of it all is found in *Homo deus*. The problems of pain and moral evil are dealt with, and there is a special discussion of the question whether war is a biological necessity. The closing chapter deals with the kingdoms of man and God. Here the writer manifestly feels himself to be somewhat off his own ground, and his treatment of the place of Jesus Christ in a divine scheme of redemption can hardly be felt to be satisfying. The book will appeal to students of science. It is a powerful vindication of our faith that 'the Natural Order is the Divine Order.'

Mr. Ernest R. Groves, Associate Professor of Social Science in Boston University, has published an analysis of the rural social mind. *The Rural Mind and Social Welfare* (University of Chicago Press) he calls it. He deplores the ever-increasing drift of people to the cities. Following Professor Macdougall, he holds this is not due to economic necessity, but to the 'imperious influence of the gregarious instinct.' 'Men and women,' he says, 'as never before wish to feel the zest of herd joys; in both work and play, they detest isolation.' The herd instinct was enormously strengthened by war conditions, and for this reason Professor Groves thinks the placing of former soldiers and sailors on the land will have little success. He deplores the drift citywards, fearing that the special contribution made by rural dwellers to national life may be lost. The good bibliography at the end of each chapter increases the value of the book.

It is one of the most hopeful signs of our time that under the auspices of the Temperance Council of the Christian Churches, all religious denominations, including Anglican, Free, Roman Catholic, and the Salvation Army, are uniting in a national campaign against the evils of the traffic in intoxicating drink, to be carried on next year. The Rev. Henry Carter, General Secretary of the Temperance and Social Welfare Department of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, has edited *The Church and the Drink Evil: A Challenge to Christian Citizenship*, a volume of about 100 pages, published at 1s. 6d. It contains four lectures delivered at the High Ashurst Summer School last summer, two of which were by Mr. Carter himself. There is a 'foreword' by the Bishop of Croydon, chairman of the Temperance Council.

Mr. Carter's chief aim, as the Bishop of Croydon points out, is to enable his readers 'to realize the overwhelming responsibility of the Christian Churches at the present time and of the individuals of which they are composed.' He has himself written on 'The Responsibility of the Church.' He does not shirk anything. He is as fearless as he is forcible. He answers fully and frankly those who quote Scripture in favour of the use of wine, and quotes from Professor Macalister in 'Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible,' who writes: 'The teaching of Christ as to the pernicious effects of intemperance is clear and explicit, and the Apostle Paul has stated the case for total abstinence in Ro 14 in a way which does not require the treacherous aid of doubtful exegesis for its support.'

A Memorial Sermon.

THE REVELATION OF IMMORTALITY.[1]

By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

'Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.'—2 Ti 1[10].

Even Paul was not always at his best. High tides of the Spirit kept surging through his mighty heart, breaking ever higher and still higher. But to him also there came dull grey days when the receding waters left only pools and shallows on a heart grown, for the moment, largely bare and dry. Once, for example, he committed himself to the really fearsome saying that if this life be all, then let us eat and drink and frivol through it anyhow, what does it matter, if to-morrow we are dead! Hearing which, standing by the graveside of a child of his, Huxley felt gathering within him a hot indignation, a passion of contemptuous scorn for a view so mean. And surely we do choose righteousness, not only for its wages, but itself: and surely, even if we can never break through to a complete victory, we will die still fighting toward it. Tired and ill, the ageing, homeless, weary man who had staked everything on the cause, and not too much seemed to be coming of it all, stumbled and lost step for an instant, when he cried despondently that if in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men the most miserable! At which one gasps in utter astonishment. It is so monstrously untrue! Who that ever knew Christ could possibly subscribe to that? Even if there were no after-life, if the grave ended everything, would we not still choose Him, for the glory of the struggle, for the splendour of His friendship, for the rapture and the richness of the life He gives us even here and even now, compared to which all the world's booths look dusty and tawdry and bedraggled, and their goods vulgar and soiled?

All which, of course, Paul knew immensely better than we do. And yet, as life advances, do we not understand increasingly how it thrilled him to be sure of immortality, and how his heart exulted at the thought of that vast unthinkable inheritance with which Christ has endowed us? For what a colossal difference it makes! Think of it! There are poor souls with hearts as tender and sensitive as our own, and for them there is nothing beyond the horizons of this cramped and narrow present! Their setting suns open no golden vistas far out into the infinities. For them this is all—this tiny islet of a life which the ruthless waves of time keep tearing down so swiftly and remorselessly. And they themselves are ephemerids, with this brief day and then no more of them, but only the great silence; and their deepest affections are only transient shadows blown along the hills, and gone; and when their dear ones leave them, it is a final separation without any ray of hope; all that they knew and loved has crumbled into nothingness, and it can never be again—can never be ever again! The 'blank stare of the grave' ends everything, and there is nothing on the farther side.

> No motion has she now, no force,
> She neither hears nor sees;
> Rolled round in earth's diurnal course
> With rocks, and stones, and trees,—

a dead thing among things as dead.

But we know that we are encompassed by an everlasting loving-kindness that will never cease: can stand and watch our loved ones sail out along a lane of gold straight into the glory of the setting sun, until our dazzled eyes lose sight of them somewhere in that splendour. For us, cries Paul, there is no death. It is abolished. It is blotted out. And if sore hearts, sitting in lonesome places, with hands feeling for what they used to have, cry out that it is still a grim and dreadful reality, which pretty words cannot explain away, Paul answers, but that is not death—that passing at a step from one bright and sunny room into another even sunnier and brighter. You never tasted the real bitterness of it all—you who can face it, knowing that you are as imperishable as the Eternal God Himself. 'This is not the end of me,' said Campbell Bannerman on his deathbed, when his colleague rose to go; 'we shall meet again, Asquith.' You

[1] A sermon preached on the death of the Rev. James Hastings, D.D., in Beechgrove Church, Aberdeen.

who know that your dear ones are as real as ever, not gone out like a light suddenly extinguished that leaves only a blank empty silent blackness; you who can hear blown back to you from the other world that shout of happy voices that your hearts remember, giving thanks and praise. Blessed be God who has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. For, with the rising of that sun, the cold night is gone, and a fair prospect stretches out and out endlessly before our eyes.

If it be true! But how does the gospel prove and make certain this glorious thing? Surely, to begin with, by its sense of the bigness of man, of every one. What a tremendous conception it has of a human life—how staggering, how awesome! Long, long ago, at the beginning of beginningless eternity, God was struck by a thought that fascinated Him, so that He said, 'I will create this, I will make it real.' And for interminable ages He was content to plan, to prepare, to toil for that. 'Immense,' says Whitman, 'have been the preparations for me. Faithful and true the hands that have helped me. Cycles have ferried my cradle, rowing and rowing like cheerful boatmen.' And at long length you came, God's thought embodied, His dream worked out at last! And is this all that is to come of it, these brief seventy years, and half of them mere sleeping? Does God tire so quickly of His majestic creations, and, like a capricious child, wipe out what He has finished, and forthwith draw something else on the blank space, with never a further thought of what went before?

Sometimes that seems likely enough for ourselves. We are so drab, so prosaic, so unimpressive, so lost in the crowd and entirely indistinguishable from our fellows at a very little distance, that, abashed, we feel there is no special necessity for our continuance—we, turned out by the myriad and according to pattern. Yet have you never felt what Browning felt, that you 'Know this earth is not my sphere. For I cannot so narrow me but that I still exceed it'; that there are prophecies and indications in you of something beyond; that there is more in you than can find expression here; that you are bigger than this life, larger than time; that, if this be all, then you have been fashioned ridiculously out of proportion to your environment? As Cowper once ended a letter to his cousin, Lady Hesketh, 'There is not room enough for friendship to unfold itself in full bloom in such a nook of a life as this. Therefore I am, and must, and will be, yours for ever, William Cowper.'

At all events, we know people built on so large a scale that immortality seems the one possibility for them. When the Lord Christ died, those who loved and knew Him could not picture Him as dead. After the first stunning, sickening shock, the thing just would not grip their minds. Surely those kind hands must somewhere still be leaping out in eager helpfulness for all hurt things; and surely that unselfish heart must still be carrying other people's burdens, as it always had. It seemed to them no wild crazy tale that He was alive, but on the contrary far likelier than not. Nature loses nothing, uses every atom jealously, over and over and over again. And that vast mass of love and kindness and unselfishness, which all His prodigal expenditure of it had, they felt, in no way exhausted, was all that just thrown away? Thirty years! It would take a whole eternity for that royal nature to express itself. And so they easily pictured Him to themselves as not dead but alive; as seated upon the right hand of God for ever; nay, they amended that—as standing, for in His eagerness to help and plead for all needy souls He has sprung to His feet, is using His whole being, yonder as here, on their behalf, and will do so for ever.

And we have known people so big, so loving, so richly endowed, gifted with so generous an equipment at God's hands that all that they do, however brilliant and gracious, seems only a preface, a first chapter, a beginning. There must be far more. Marcus Dods had little poetry in him, but he once breaks out into the pure gold of it, when, commenting on one of the most mysterious of our Lord's sayings, he argues that as yet we are only children in the nursery; and that, as other bairns reveal their character with exactness when among their games and toys; as this one, grasping and peevish about his card houses, will be selfish and ill-tempered out in the real world; and this other, brave and good-natured over a childish trouble, will face the ills of grown life uncomplainingly; so these little ploys of ours, which seem so big to us, are at least a sufficient test of us and make clear who of us can be safely trusted to be set, no longer to transient things which at worst can be rubbed out again, but to the eternal realities which can never pass away. We shall

grow up; shall pass out into the real world, and

> Doubtless unto them is given
> A life that bears immortal fruit
> In those great offices that suit
> The full-grown energies of heaven.

Man is too big for this to be all; it takes a whole eternity to justify the scale and plan on which he has been fashioned.

Further, says the gospel, it is obvious that we are being trained for something. Here is this difficult life of ours, with its pain, its trials, its temptations, and the like. And what is to be made of it? Given that axiom of the faith that it is all a discipline, an education, deftly chosen to correct our faults, and produce in us that which will make us serviceable to God and our fellows, a fashioning of us under the blows of fate and on the anvil of circumstance into a weapon ready to God's hand, and sharpened for His purpose, then it becomes intelligible; and even when the winds are howling round us, catching away our breath, and leaving us cold and shivery, we can see that it is right and kind and wise; can trust where we don't understand; can bear the pain if it have meaning in it; can face the sudden darkness without growing overmuch afraid; can lose what is dear to us, and yet look up into God's face with eyes that trust Him, and a heart that is unflustered, because certain that He chooses wisely and well.

But if this life be all, how difficult it all becomes, how senseless it all seems, how the baffled heart cries out in sheer bewilderment and agony, Why, and Why, and again Why! A mind prepares itself through long, strenuous, laborious years, is ready for some high achievement, and then, sudden as a shot bird, it is struck down. Was all the preparation wasted? Or a man slowly and with pain, through God's guidance and help, fashions his character into a clean, strong, beautiful thing; and just as it is nearing perfection, he is swept out. Has God, then, interest only in the making of things, but none in the things when made? The problem has been solved; and He pushes aside the pieces, sets them up again for the unravelling of another riddle, the working out of holiness, given another setting of the board. And is experience only a mocking voice that tells us too late what we should have done, with no practical value in it; as the man in Browning's poem looks back on life and sees it all—and knows now how the game should have been played—too late—for he is dying. Are we set to learn how life ought to be lived? And, having learned it, are we given no chance to put it into action? It is so obvious that we are being trained for something; we can feel God's hands at work upon us, the bite of His chisel, the strokes that are working out His plan in the dour lump of our character. And does that something never come? It was Arthur Balfour who said that 'if there be no other life, then this world is a stupid joke. And whose joke?' At least, surely Bishop Butler was right when he argued that this life is a first volume, which demands another to explain and complete it.

But our Lord comes to the problem, mainly from a different angle.

Browning in a passionate passage cries out fiercely:

> If this be all
> And other life awaits us not—for me
> I say 'tis a poor cheat, a stupid bungle,
> A wretched failure. I for one protest
> Against it, and I hurl it back with scorn.

That is perhaps too peevish a reading of this glorious life of ours. Ah! think of it! Out of nothingness God formed us, and in sheer goodwill set us thus high in the scale of being, august creatures, who can look before and after, can think His thoughts afar off after Him and hold communion with Himself, and has thought out for us this wonderful life teeming with rich interests. Shall we poutingly fling this amazing thing down at His feet, as not worth having! And yet Christ agrees with him, or at least tells us bluntly that if this life were all, it would be a gift quite unworthy of God, and with no trace of His characteristic generosity and largesse; founds on God's love and faithfulness; and bids us remember that His love is an eternal love, His faithfulness an everlasting faithfulness. God's affections are not mere tents of a night, soon struck again: so that where to-day they are, to-morrow there is nothing. Where God loves at all, He loves eternally. 'I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob'; 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' Can even we forget? A little one is taken, and the full years come and go. And there are other little voices in one's ears, and other little feet upon the floor. And yet always the mother's heart remembers and is not quite satisfied. And God! Does He love us the little moment we are here,

and then the others take our places, and He is quite content without us? No, cries Christ, and there is almost anger in His tones! 'As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read what was spoken by God: "I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob"? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' Do you imagine this is all that God can do for us—this that is accomplished before we die? We give ourselves to Him, and even here it is a glory that whoso has tasted would not renounce for the whole world. And yet is it not as yet very largely a dream unattained, a yearning unsatisfied, a stretching out of groping hands that still come far short? And must not these shadows be thrown on our hearts by something, something real, something solid? Must not our dreams come true at last, and we be all that God Himself has taught our souls to yearn to be? Or else is not our conception of a worthy life bigger than God's, and our dreams nobler and finer and higher than His realities? Here, above all, are not Cowper's words unanswerable? This nook of a life is far too cramped a place for God's love and God's friendship to come to its full flower, and so we know that He is, must, and will be ours for ever. It takes a whole eternity for God's love toward us to work itself out. Remember, says Christ, that His grace is an everlasting thing that never tires, never runs dry, that even Calvary is only a cupful out of a river brimming and full as ever, that all that you experience here is a mere rill that loses itself in an ocean; and you too will lose yourself in it, be swept out by tremendous currents, with Divine love about you and beneath you and breaking over you, and on all sides of you far as the eye can reach and infinitely further—for there is no bound, no shore, no end to this illimitable thing. 'So I saw in my dream,' says Bunyan, 'that these two men came up to the gate, and as they entered they were transfigured, and there was given them raiment that shone like gold, and all the bells of the city rang for joy. And after that they shut up the gates, which when I had seen I wished myself among them.' Blessed be God who has taken away the terror, and the blankness, and the loneliness, and has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.

Perhaps no finer tribute could be paid to him than that our minds can pass from all the splendour of these large Scripture truths and visions to Dr. Hastings, without any jolt or jar or sense of incongruity. Rather they all seem to fit him; and he has made them likelier to us—this man whose natural end, we feel, is such a glorious consummation as we have been describing.

It has been for us a real distinction to have had as our fellow-worshipper one whose name is known in every Christian church and by many scholars of the alien faiths; whose death has caused a thrill of real regret the whole world over as the loss of one who in our difficult transition times has been able to do more than most to open vistas into truth and the newer ways of stating it, to steady staggered minds and shaken faiths.

Here was a man who gave whole-heartedly to Jesus Christ all that he had—his time, his strength, his gifts, keeping back nothing. And his was a princely offering—a certain stateliness of mind that conceived and dreamed on a colossal scale; an intrepid gallantry that set to work upon what looked impossible; an untiring energy that makes one weary even to think of it, obeying Browning's law 'this life must be lived out, and a grave thoroughly earned'; an unflagging spirit that long before one huge scheme was ended was already at work on another and still huger, wheeling in ever-widening circles to the very end, so that he died with an enormous output to his credit, but with his brain still teeming with ideas and new plans.

And this, surely, was very notable, that, immersed in the intricacies of theology, his own faith remained so simple and practical. 'Don't you admire a man,' asked Dods, writing of Sanday and his critical studies, 'who with all that, keeps his eye steadily on the great things and preserves the fineness of his feelings and devoutness?' Such a man was James Hastings, whose religion was as simple as a child's, and his affection for Christ very practical. There was a time in Dundee when he was driven almost off his feet, went about always with his pockets bulging with proofs on theological subtleties, which he read even in cars and cabs and at such odd moments as he could snatch, and yet in that crowded life he made room, in addition to his ministry, for a definite piece of mission work, visiting himself persistently from house to house and door to door over and over and over again. And later, here in Aberdeen, he flamed out into passionate social service as an unwearied leader in the temperance crusade.

But it was his own character that was his greatest work and his most masterly achievement.

It had that hall-mark of greatness that is never absent, a childlike humility, a complete unawaredness of his own size. Who of us realized that this man slipping in and out among us, and with whom the plainest member felt no diffidence nor shyness, possessed a name known everywhere? His nature was made of a fine material; was enviably clean, removed from every grossness, loyal and lovable and kindly. Not a few have told me that always when they looked at him they thought of Jesus Christ. Nor have I ever known a worshipper more obviously in earnest, and lost in the service. The man's whole being was entirely concentrated on it and absorbed in it. So much so that, even in this worshipful congregation, when I felt that the sermon was bad, I used to look hopefully to see if he were present, feeling that if he were—and he was always with us night and morning—there were two of us in it, and together we might pull it through.

His was a fine life finely used. And it must have been with His face lit with pleasure that the Master greeted him, and cried out, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' And among all the services he rendered, and all for which we owe him thanks, would we not put that first—that he pleased Jesus Christ, whom we so often disappoint, and gave a full and loyal service to Him, whom most of us treat in so niggardly a fashion?

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

Dr. Ditlef Nielsen is Assistant Librarian in the University of Copenhagen. Attracted by the study of ancient Arabian inscriptions recently discovered, he has devoted himself to profound investigation of the oldest Semitic culture and the history of Semitic religion. Those inscriptions, he remarks, have revealed astonishing and unexpected things, which he proceeds to set forth in a large volume[1] richly illustrated and written in delightful style. He groups the results of his investigation round the conception of Trinity, which he finds to be very old and very wide-spread. This volume deals only with the *Three Divine Persons*. Another is to follow on the *Three Nature-Divinities*.

Let us say at once of the present volume that it gives evidence on every page of diligent study, patient research and reading of amazing range. It is a book of which account will have to be taken. One may doubt—we do doubt—the validity of many of its conclusions. But we accept it as a storehouse of facts, many of them curious and not a few of them startling.

The author rightly emphasizes the need there is for a study of Semitic religion as a whole, so as to arrive at some just notion of what that religion was like in its primitive stages, and along what lines it developed. Too often has the mistake been made of fixing upon some highly developed form such as the Babylonian, and taking it as the norm from which the others more or less deviate. That is to forget that the Semitic race and religion were old long before Babylonian religion, as we see it fully evolved, arose.

The author's task is to show that away back in primitive Semitic religion was a Trinity, and he traces this out in all its manifold ramifications. His conclusion, we think, will not command general agreement, if any agreement at all. It is that Christianity is largely just a going back to the primitive ideas which, despite Judaism, lingered on among the common people in certain regions. There it found its Trinity, its Sacraments, its Incarnation, its Virgin Birth, its atoning Death, its Resurrection; all, in short, that is characteristic of Christianity was lying there for ages, needing only to be 'refined.' Jesus, in fact, was unnecessary. The New Testament is thus in a real sense far older than the Old Testament. It is a total mistake to think of it being a development of the Old Testament, for Judaism had banished Trinity in favour of Unity. In the N.T. we have Trinity, but no Unity; that came into Christianity only with the definitions by General Councils. We do not believe this. We do not accept this as a tenable view at all. It is a valuable book, we think, from the view-

[1] *Der Dreieinige Gott in religionshistor. Beleuchtung*, pp. 472. Copenhagen, 1922.

point of Comparative Religion. As a history of religion it appears to be desperately weak. It proceeds on the easy but fallacious assumption that where you find some measure of resemblance you not only may, but must, infer some real connexion. America was discovered long before Columbus was born, yet, for all that matters in the history of mankind, Columbus was not only quite independent and ignorant of his predecessors, he was the real discoverer. Christianity is not to be explained by discovering something in a very ancient world that bears a dim resemblance to its fundamental doctrines.

Dr. A. Baumgarten of Bonn has published a history of Syrian literature (*Geschichte d. syr. Literatur*, pp. viii + 378; Bonn, 1922). It is the kind of work which only a German Professor can accomplish, a monument of industry devoted to a subject little known and of little general interest. This work is no doubt painfully accurate and complete, but it will not increase the interest in Syrian literature. It is an annotated catalogue rather than a history, so full of contractions and references by means of initials and numbers that pages of it seem at first glance to contain curious chemical formulæ.

In *Analekten zur Text-kritik d. A.T., neue Folge* (pp. 131; Leipzig, 1922), Felix Perles indicates in how many ways errors were apt to creep into the Hebrew text. In many passages he seems to prove his point.

On the perennial problem of the Fourth Gospel, Dr. G. Bert writes, *D. Evan.-d. Johannes* (pp. 144; Gutersloh, 1922). He comes to the 'orthodox' conclusion. He does not solve, nor even face, the real difficulties of a Son-of-Zebedee authorship. His work is valuable, however, for its careful study of the Logos-doctrine in Greek philosophy, and for its collocation of passages from the Odes of Solomon.

The *Palästina-Jahrbuch* for 1921 is as interesting and informative as any of its predecessors. We have a good description and historical account of Tekoa by W. Sütterlin, and a careful study of Jewish and Roman military organization in New Testament times by F. Lundgreen. Dalman demolishes the myth, published in 'Adventist' journals, that manna had become once more the food of the people of Palestine, and was so abundant that it was being exported: 'It is wonderful,' said *The Bible Advocate*, 'what the Lord is doing in our days.' Unfortunately, nobody on the spot where the manna was alleged to be falling in such abundance knew anything about it.

W. D. Niven.

Aberdeen.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Getting rid of the Dross.

'I will turn my hand upon thee, and throughly purge away thy dross.'—Is 1[25].

A minister was once taken over the famous Kimberley diamond mines. He was shown the blasting, the loads of blue ground coming up from the mine, the great floors on which the blue ground is spread out and left to crumble, then the crushing and washing through which it is made to pass. But what interested him most was the final stages. The ground had been washed down to a gravel in which lay the diamonds. This gravel was then placed on a machine like a table, which was slightly tilted forward and smeared with a kind of grease. Then this table was set a-shaking and over the shaking surface a stream of water came pouring. Everything that was worthless, all the pebbles and the useless stones were carried away in the stream. But the diamonds remained. You saw them before you when the table had ceased to move, studded over the surface, shining and precious.

Not long ago I had an opportunity of talking with the head of a large school for boys who had not had the advantages that belong to a good home. I could see that his plan was to try to find whatever was good in these boys. He looked for diamonds amongst them. And he went on the same lines as that adopted at Kimberley. The

boys were first cut off from associations which did them harm. Very often these were in their own poor homes. That was the blasting. Then discipline began. A bath, new clothes, obedience to rules, regular work at lessons or something else, punishments if necessary. That was the rest of the process. What was the result? One found amongst these poor laddies many a real gem, a boy without the dross.

Boys and girls, you like your school-fellows in the playground to be without dross. You like them to be above board, straight and true. You like them to be unselfish and ready to give up to others. You like them to be without conceit or 'side.' If they are selfish or deceitful or snobbish or conceited you haven't the same love for them. The more dross they have in their character the less you want to make friends of them. And it is the same in the wide wide world. The world has no use for drossy people.

Here is the story of a grown-up man who had dross in his character. A great business man engaged him at a big salary. Afterwards, chancing to meet a friend, he told him that the man would have to go. 'I can't stand him,' he said, 'he started by bothering me about where he was to sit, and sent me half a dozen notes the second day asking who would pay his salary.' That man lost his salary because it was too high for any one who asked fussy questions and did no work. That man was mostly dross.

How are you to get rid of the dross that is about you? To a big person one might say 'Cultivate the presence of God.' In simple language that means make a friend of God, tell Him your difficulties, say you want Him to help you to grow up the best man or woman that it is possible for you to be.

To be a good man or woman means a great deal. It means honour, duty, courage, love, justice, mercy. How are boys and girls to have all these? It sounds as if it were a very hard thing to be good. In one sense it is simple.

Jesus brought the thought of God as a Father into the world, and He left His message to be handed down to you and me. We get rid of the dross that is about our characters by making Him our Friend and keeping constantly in His presence. Then we get into the habit of doing what is right. It becomes natural. The girls know that, if they practise the piano a very great deal, they at last get to play the correct notes without ever having to think. To be like Christ is not easy. It takes constant practice and constant prayer. But it is more than worth it. This world would be a delightful place to live in if all the people in it tried to live like Jesus Christ. Your Heavenly Father is willing to help you to grow up to be men and women whose lives will make the world better. Resolve to-day that such a life will be yours.

Picking a Side.[1]

'As touching the election.'—Ro 11^{28}.

Some weeks ago you kept hearing about something called an election, didn't you? Dad talked of it, and mother talked of it, and all the people who came in talked of it, till you grew sick and tired of it, and still the talk went on. What was it all about, and why were people so excited over it? Your big brother would come running home, and he must have his tea up to the minute, because he was going to a meeting; and mother was as bad, would ask you to come from your lessons and help to clear the things away, because she was going too. And father sat reading at the paper every evening as earnestly and as long as if every night were Saturday night; and yet, when you keeked across his shoulder you could see no football results at all, just columns and columns of speeches that looked dreadfully stale and dry! What was wrong with them all? Well, you know we need to have people in Parliament to speak for us and to look after matters for us, because we can't all be there ourselves. Mother can't go, for what would become of Baby! And Dad has to stay here, or how would you get on without him! And yet somebody must go: and in every place, perhaps two, perhaps three, perhaps four, people said, 'We'll go for you.' And that was very good, but what were we to do, for only one of them could be sent, and we had got to choose which one. And what was happening was that people everywhere were making up their minds, listening and watching and deciding which of them they would send. You small folk often have elections of your own. Every time at school that the team for a house match is put up in the corridor you sprint along to see if you are in it: and sometimes you are, and sometimes you are not. That's an election. Some are chosen, some

[1] By the Rev. A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

are not. And you wee ones never start a game without picking a side, or finding who has got to be 'it': 'Eenie, Meenie, Minie, Mo' you chant, and at the end 'You're in, and you're out.' Well, that is an election. You manage it all in half a minute; but big people, who are slower at some things than you, take a full fortnight or three weeks. But then, you see, it is a great honour to be elected for Parliament. It doesn't matter very much who is picked upon your side at games, though you like to be chosen, and not left on and on until the very last or nearly so. But to be chosen for Parliament is a big thing, and that's why people take a long time to make up their minds whom they will send. And the wonderful thing I have to tell you is this. God once had an election. There was something, a great big important thing, He wanted to have done; and He Himself could not go to do it, and whom would He send? It mattered far too much to pick just any one, and God thought and thought, and wondered how this one would do, or that one, or somebody still better; but at last He made up His mind and He elected—whom do you think but you? If you had gone to these big meetings at election time, perhaps with thousands in the hall, and had got up upon the platform and said, 'You had better vote for me,' every one would have laughed at you. You're too small to elect. And yet God has elected you for some great work He must have done. 'I must have you on My side,' He said, and chose you as His first pick. There's that life of yours—God thought it out and planned it. What a wonderful thing it is! How much you can do with it, how many big and clean and unselfish things you can pack into it! You remember when you started for your summer holidays, whole two months of them, it seemed as if they never could end. Every day was so long and splendid, and on every one of them you could fish, and you could cycle, and you could climb, and you could golf, and you could play all kinds of games, and all this in one day; and you had whole two months of it before you. But look at your life; perhaps you have whole years and years and years of it, fifty perhaps, or even sixty, or it may be even seventy! What can't you do with a long life like that? And when God had thought it out, all that He wanted done with it, He thought, 'Whom will I choose to live this life for Me, who will do it best, and make the most of it, and use it as I wish it used.' And out of all His people He could think of He elected you. And every day there are things that you can do for Him. He wants some one to help mother, and here's the very little lass to do that for Me, so He thought, and He gave the chance of doing it to you. He wishes some one to be decent to that new boy at school, and He asks that from you; and so with heaps and heaps of things.

It is a great honour to be elected to Parliament; when any one is chosen he always returns thanks, as it is called—that is to say, he makes a speech, and says how proud he is to be so trusted, and promises that he will do his very best, that if he can help any one in any kind of way they have only to write and let him know and he will always do all that he can. And don't you think it is a wonderful honour to be picked by God; that He should trust you as He does, should look to you to do lots and lots of things for Him that He wants? And aren't you going to thank Him for it? and to promise Him that you are going to try never to fail Him, but to do your very, very best?

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Spiritual Glow.

'Fervent in spirit.'—Ro 12^{11}.

What do we mean by an enthusiasm? We mean an intense and generous passion for some supreme interest, so passionate that it dominates the life. And what do we mean by the defensive powers of such an enthusiasm? We mean that such a passion gathers all the forces of life into its own swift goings, so that nothing is left to loiter, nothing is left to trail along in aimless vagrancy. A noble enthusiasm is defensive because it makes life whole and wholesome. This kind of fire tends to keep everything clean.

There may be a bewitching pleasure, a luring indolence, a seductive mischief, but if the man has a passion for learning it is a defensive enthusiasm which destroys the assailments as in a consuming fire.

It is even so with the passionate championship of some great ideal. Emerson's counsel has now become a familiar phrase: 'Hitch your wagon to a star!' It is the wedding of idealism to very mundane tasks. There can be a noble passion in common toil. Yes, and when we do hitch our

wagon to a star, we may be perfectly sure that, whatever the star may do for the wagon, it will irradiate the wagoner and protect him by the ministry of sacred flame.

But when enthusiasm begins to cool our defensive energy begins to wane. Just as soon as radiation ceases invasion begins. Admiral Peary has told us, in his account of the discovery of the North Pole, that it was in the dreary, weary Arctic winter, when enthusiasm waned, that the hidden weakness of his men appeared. As the fires died low quarrelsomeness stole in. The moral defences departed with the glow.

'Be fervent in spirit,' says St. Paul. 'Maintain the spiritual glow' (Dr. Moffatt's translation). This urgent counsel was given to a little company of disciples who were living their consecrated life in the city of Rome. Think of their environment. They were beset by evil incitements and suggestions and antagonisms. They lived and moved where the majesty of evil had its throne and sovereignty. And the Apostle Paul tells them that nothing but a passionate religion will endow them with needful resistance. Tepid devotion will afford no defences.

There is no other counsel of the Apostle which is more urgent and timely for our own day. Now, as then, our spiritual enthusiasms are our moral defences.

1. Let us turn the light of the Apostle's counsel upon the *individual life*. When our devotion to Christ maintains a spiritual glow everything in our life shares the gracious influence of the quickening heat. It is like a garden where every unsprung seed thrills to the common touch of the spring-tide sun.

And as such a fire-possessed life is whole and wholesome, so is it also secure. Its fire is its defence. When night falls upon the explorer in the African jungle he seeks for a clearing and he lights a fire, and the cheery flame is his protection against the prowling beast. But if our fires abate, every noble faculty of life feels the withdrawal of the central heat. Ay, but more than this, the lessening of the fires means the loss of our defences. When the fire in the forest dies down, the wild beast always draws near.

2. Now turn the light of the Apostle's counsel to social fellowship, and let it fall upon the *corporate life of the Church*. When there is a spiritual glow in the Church, mean things are consumed like dirt in a furnace. But let the Church lose her spiritual glow and all manner of un-Christly things swarm across her desecrated floors. We have a glaring example of all this in the state of the Church at Corinth as it is revealed to us by the Apostle Paul.

There is an equally startling revelation of the smallness which invades a lukewarm Church in the example of the Church at Jerusalem. The Church in Jerusalem had no missionary enthusiasm because it had lost its spiritual glow. When the great missionary-Apostle returned from the last and greatest of his missionary tours he reported his work to the Church in Jerusalem. And what happened? Paul had kindled a line of holy fires through Asia Minor. Sacred beacons were blazing in Macedonia and lower Greece. Isles of the sea had become luminous with the light of life. He had incurred perils innumerable. He bore the marks of the Lord Jesus. And he was now old and broken, but his quenchless fire was burning. 'He declared particularly what God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry.' And what did they say about it? In what kind of holy rapture did they express their glowing praise? 'Thou knowest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law.' Yes, and what next? They urged him to take a purifying vow and to shave his head! Can you imagine that if that Church had been glowing with a passion of devotional love to the Lord, such a peddling bit of Jewish ritual would have been forced into a season of spiritual wonder and exuberance?

And we need not go to ancient Corinth and Jerusalem for examples. We have examples in the Church to-day, when the spiritual glow has gone out and organism is supplanted by organization. What would the glow do for us? It would bring union. The Scriptures say nothing about welding sundered things into vital fellowship, but they do speak about separated things flowing together into union. We have been rather like ecclesiastical blacksmiths trying to weld lukewarm Churches into vital Communion. But before things can flow together they must have become molten. We must have molten affections, fluid sympathies; we must have genialities and fraternities flowing like molten streams from a central fire.

3. So it is in *international life*. Peoples become one only in the uniting energies of noble fire. We have seen the uniting power of a commanding passion in the fiery travail of the Great War.

This was especially true in the relations of the British and American peoples. Old prejudices melted away like icebergs in tropical seas. Antipathies which were the creation of a hundred years changed into friendship. We found each other, and we saw each other, in the revealing fires of a vast enthusiasm, and all the meaner things perished like stubble in the flame. Are we maintaining the glow? Or are the old evil things creeping back? How can we repel them if so? Only by feeding the fires of a large and noble enthusiasm. Everybody can bring fuel to the holy flame. We can strengthen it with knowledge, we can feed it with thought, we can quicken it with expression, we can deepen it with prayer. We can live and labour for the passion of fraternity, the enthusiasm of humanity, the glow of Christ, the fire of God.[1]

Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly dove,
With all Thy quickening powers,
Kindle a flame of sacred love
On these cold hearts of ours.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Human Argument.

'Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'—Mt 8^{10}.

Although Jesus did many wonderful things, He never seems to have marvelled at them Himself. The consciousness that He wielded powers which had been given to no other does not appear to have amazed Him. Every thoughtful man, although he knows that he exercises no power which is not equally in the possession of others, is nevertheless burdened by the very abilities which constitute his being. 'I am fearfully and wonderfully made,' said the psalmist.

But Christ was never oppressed with the mystery that He was. And when He spoke of Himself, He used words of the utmost precision, and expressions which are amazing in their repose, for 'I know,' saith He, 'whence I came and whither I go.'

Neither did He marvel at the many marvellous things around Him. He met disease in its various forms and degrees; but whilst His nature went out in spontaneous sympathy towards the sufferer whomsoever he should be, He never wondered at any one's pain. And again when He confronted sin, whether under the coverlet of its false refinements or exposed in the nakedness of its natural grossness, it failed to astonish Him.

But what is stranger still is that He marvelled at nothing which came to Him from above. He could hold converse with Moses and Elias, the choicest spirits of the past, and be transfigured before His followers until His face did shine as the sun and His raiment was white as the light, and the silence became vocal, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

And yet He *could* marvel. It is said of Him that He once marvelled at the unbelief of the people, and here that He marvelled at the centurion's faith. Christ could wonder that some had no faith, and wonder equally that some others had. If we have had the opportunity of spiritual knowledge and culture in our homes and through our friendships, much is demanded of us, because He knows that much has been given us.

The conditions under which the faith of the centurion of Capernaum appeared were as difficult as they could be. This Roman officer was a Gentile and an outsider; how near he had come to the Jewish church we do not know, but at best he could never come really close. In the Book of Acts we see what elaborate preparation of mind was needed before Peter could be persuaded merely to enter Cornelius's house. This man knew of the existence of such antipathies, and when he reached out his hands to Jesus it was across these yawning gulfs of separation. He had no possible claim that he could urge, unless (and this is where the wonder of his faith appears)—unless this peasant teacher should prove in some way like himself. This audacious reasoning from his own heart to Christ's heart is the key to the story.

1. Conscious that he himself would do a kindness to anybody without thinking twice, he dared to believe that Jesus also might be kind. Leaping the barriers, he had actually come to love a nation which in history has not been found lovable, and he was not ashamed to show real fondness for his slave, though that was an unwonted thing in the ancient world.

And what he asked of Jesus was that He also should look below the surface, and he approached Him in the frank assurance that He would. That seems homely enough, but it was a true beginning of faith. His thoughts of Jesus were pitifully imperfect. He suspected Him of sharing the dis-

[1] J. H. Jowett, *God—Our Contemporary*, 185.

like felt even by friendly Jews to entering a Gentile house, and so he did not ask Him into his. Still the Nazarene and the centurion had common ground on which to meet. Grant that I am half a heathen still, although I built these Jews a synagogue, and my poor servant is a pagan out and out, still when he is in such agony you will surely come—simply for need's sake. And the Master answered, 'I will come and heal him.'

2. There was a second common ground. It was the possession of authority. As an officer he did not ask, he gave orders; to his men he said—Go, come, do, and he was obeyed. And he believed that Jesus also had His servants. In the Galilean land stories were filling the air of the most astounding recoveries. And what impressed the onlookers was that when Christ came to a sick-bed it was not as a sympathetic visitor, to lay a kind but helpless hand upon the sufferer; He came like one assured of His own power. Life seemed to return at His word; His confidence gave the ebbing strength a chance, and great things thus were done. One may interpret the stories as one will, but this element of authority must have its place in any explanation.

It was natural for a soldier to think of this in the terms of his own profession. I sit in my tent, but messengers are hurrying here and there upon my errands; I give commands, and my men advance, or wheel, or retire, as if the whole company were an instrument of my bare will. You also, as I hear, have troops at your command—strange, ghostly powers which wait upon your orders; and if you only give the word, my servant shall be healed. No doubt there were elements of superstition in his thought, and yet he did essential justice to one chief claim of our Lord's, who loves that men should credit Him with power.

3. But this authority, as the blunt soldier felt, was ultimately nothing less than God's authority. The third point in his reasoning was: I gain obedience from my men because I am myself under authority, because at my back there rests the majesty of empire—is there not also behind Him an Authority without limit, so that I cannot ask of Him what is too great to expect? The centurion knew that, in his company, he had men stronger and more active than himself, who yet obeyed him; and the reason was that he also was under authority, so that it was not he whom they obeyed, but the power behind him. Here in his presence stood this peasant teacher, of whom he was asking such astounding things—a young man poorly clad, with hands roughened by continual labour, and with His face marked by the effects of sleepless nights and the weight of a world of evil. What could He do? How could He bid death withdraw? But if He also is under authority! if, as He stands beside me, He has at His back the strength that sustains the world! If this man is nothing less than the representative of the sovereignty of God!

On any day of excitement when crowds are out, you may see a policeman here and there, motioning back the multitude; he could not possibly enforce his will, and yet, in a marvellous degree, he is obeyed; the mere hint of force is commonly sufficient, because at its back remains the vague sublimity of empire.

Anthropomorphism, you say? Of course! How is man to be anything else than anthropomorphic? He has no knowledge of anything that does not arrive at him through his humanity, his human organs, his human experience. Any knowledge whatever, in order to reach him, must have adapted itself to his capacities and conditions. Revealed knowledge can come in by no other channel. It depends on his natural organs to receive and to assimilate and to report it. If he is to know anything of God, he must know it in the terms of man.

Man knows whatever he knows through his humanity only. Revelation can be no exception to this primal necessity. And so his knowledge of God is inevitably anthropomorphic. And it was because anthropomorphism was so perilous and so apt to blunder that the Incarnation took place to exhibit the right standard by which to anthropomorphize God. Jesus Christ is the evidence and the verification of how God can be made known to us in human form through the flesh of our manhood.[1]

'I have not found so great faith.' But there is little profit in talking of the centurion's faith unless we have it.

In the *Paradiso* (Canto xxiv.), Dante, in answer to a question gives an accurate theologian's account of the nature and the power of faith; but his teacher replies, 'Right well hast thou run over the composition and the weight of this coin, *but tell me if thou hast it in thy purse.*' In turning to our Lord

[1] H. S. Holland, *Facts of the Faith*, 201.

are we confident that He is pitiful and great of heart, that He is strong to heal, and, most of all, that, in love and power, He is none other than the visible embodiment of Almighty God? The best of us still in these things needs to pray, 'Lord, increase my faith!'

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

The Enthroned Christ.

'Jesus . . . is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'—He 12^2.

1. We have here brought together the name of the humanity, the name that was borne by many another Jew in the same era as Jesus bore it; we have brought together the name of the humanity and the affirmation of the Divine dignity. 'Jesus . . . is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.' And over and over again, not only in this Epistle but in other parts of Scripture, we have the same intentional, emphatic juxtaposition of the two ideas which shallow thinkers regard as in some sense incompatible—the humanity and the Divinity. Remember, for instance, 'this same Jesus . . . shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go.' And remember the rapturous and wonderful exclamation which broke from the lips of the proto-martyr. 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.' So then that exaltation and ascension is—according to New Testament teaching, which is not contradicted by the deepest thought of the affinities and resemblances of the divine and the human—the lifting up of the *Man* into the glory which the Incarnate Word had with the Father before the world was. And just as the earthly life of that Incarnate Word has shown how divine a thing a human life here may be, so the heavenly life of the still Incarnate Word shows us what our approximation to, and union with, the Divine nature may be, when we are purged and perfected in the Kingdom of God, whither the Forerunner is for us entered.

2. But, in addition to this thought, there comes another which is constantly associated with the teaching of this session of the Son of Man at the right hand of God, namely, that it is intercessory. That is a word the history of which will take us far. But one thing must be made very emphatic, and that is that the ordinary notion of intercession is not the New Testament notion. We limit it, or tend to limit it, to prayer for others. There is no such idea in the New Testament use of the phrase. It is a great deal wider than any verbal expression of sympathy and desire. It has to deal with realities and not with words. It is not a synonym for asking for another that some blessing may come upon him. The intercession of the great High Priest, who has gone into the holiest of all for us, covers the whole ground of the acts by which, by reason of our deep and true union with Jesus Christ through faith, He communicates to His children whatsoever of blessing and power and sweet tokens of ineffable love He has received from the Father. Whatsoever He draws in filial dependence from the Divine Father He in brotherly unity imparts to us; and the real communication of real blessing, and not the verbal petitions for forgiveness, is what He is doing there within the veil. 'He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.'

3. But, further, in this great figure of the enthroned Christ there lies a wondrous thought which He Himself has given us. 'I go to prepare a place for you.' What activities are involved in that idea it profits us not to inquire, nor would it become us to say. We know that never could we tread those pure pavements except our robes and our feet had been washed by Him. But that is the consequence of His earthly work, and not of His heavenly and present energy. Perhaps, in our ignorance of all that lies behind the veil, we can get little further than to see that the very fact of His presence is the preparation of the place. For that awful thought, that crushing thought, of eternal life under conditions bewilderingly different from anything we experience here would be no joy unless we could say we shall see Him and be with Him.

I know not how it may be with you, but I think that the nearer we come to the end of the earthly life, and the more the realities beyond begin to press upon our thoughts and our imaginations as those with which we shall soon make acquaintance, we feel more and more how unquestionable is the misery the thought of eternal life would bring if it were not for the fact that the world beyond is lighted up and made familiar by the thought of Christ's presence there. Can you fancy some poor clod-hopping rustic brought up from a remote village and set down all in a moment in the midst

of some brilliant court? How out of place he would feel, how unhomelike it would appear, how ill at ease he would be; ay, and what an unburdening there would be in his heart, if amongst the strange splendour he detected beneath the crown and above the robes, sitting on the throne, one whom he had known in the far-off hamlet, and who there had taken part with him in all the ignoble toils and narrow interests of that rustic scene. Jesus said, 'I go to prepare a place for you,' and when I lift up my eyes to those far-off realities which overwhelm me, when I try to think about them, I say, I am not dazzled by the splendour, I am not oppressed by the perpetuity of it, I do not faint at the thought of unlike conditions, for I shall be the same and I will be with Him.[1]

Thou who didst stoop below
To drain the cup of woe,
Wearing the form of frail mortality;
Thy blessed labours done,
Thy crown of victory won,
Hast passed from earth, passed to Thy home on high.

Our eyes behold Thee not,
Yet hast Thou not forgot
Those who have placed their hope, their trust in Thee;
Before Thy Father's face
Thou hast prepared a place,
That where Thou art there they may also be.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Rooted.

'Rooted in him.'—Col 2[7].

There is a great deal of interest in Christ at the present time. It is doubtful if in all the history of Christianity since the very earliest days there has ever been so much; but there is a danger in that very interest. Things which are widespread are apt to be superficial, and *that* is just where the danger lies. The interest is largely superficial, emotional, intellectual, but there is not much *will* in it. Christ is made as attractive as possible, and as little as possible is demanded of those who would follow Him.

But that is not the Christ that we know in the Gospels. The Christ to whom we owe nothing but admiration is ineffective; He does not go deep enough. If we are to receive from Christ what He came to give us we must do more than look upon Him from the outside and admire Him. We must be ourselves 'rooted in him.'

What does it mean? It means more than admiring Him. It means living by Him. It means more even than believing Him. It means—to use the words of the New Testament—'believing *on* him,' that is to say, trusting ourselves to Him. It means living by Him. It means making Him our life, our hope, our all. It is what Paul means when he says, 'to me to live is Christ.'

How often Christ speaks of 'abiding' in Him. In the 15th chapter of John the word occurs again and again, and it occurs more frequently in the original than it does in our translation. Instead of 'abide' our translators have sometimes rendered the word 'continue.' For instance, in the 9th verse, 'as the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love.' That is the same word as is translated 'abide' twice in the next verse. 'If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love.' Then again in the very next verse the same word is translated 'remain.' 'These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you.' If they had translated the word every time by 'abide' we should have seen far more clearly the tremendous emphasis that Christ puts upon the necessity of our being *part* of Him. Instead of looking upon Him and admiring Him from a distance we must belong to Him. We must suffer when He suffers; we must rejoice when He rejoices; we must draw our nourishment from Him, and so be able to do the work which He has given us to do. We must be rooted in Him.

There are three uses of a root.

1. First of all *it is necessary for the life of a plant.* Cut the plant off from its root and it dies. And as with the plant so with you and me—the soil is Christ; we have to throw our roots deep down into Him. Cut off from the soil the plant certainly perishes, and we perish also if we are cut off from Christ. Of course we can have a bodily life without Him. A man may be perfectly vigorous of body who has no more of Christ in Him than an ox. And we may have a social life without Him. But we shall not have a spiritual life unless we are rooted in Christ, and if we have not a

[1] Alexander Maclaren.

spiritual life the social and bodily life do not count for much.

We see this most clearly when we think of death. And by this Christ does not mean the death of the body. You remember what He said to Martha after the death of Lazarus? 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, *even though he have died*, yet shall he be alive.' What He meant was that although Lazarus had died bodily, he was yet spiritually alive. Then He went on to say, 'Whosoever is alive, and believeth in me, shall never die.'

So in order to be alive, we must believe in Him. We must be united *to* Him. We must be rooted *in* Him; for that is the first use of the root—it is necessary for the life of the plant.

2. But the root is of use to the plant in another way. *It carries nourishment to it.*

And just in the same way we must be rooted in Christ if we are to live a healthy spiritual life. We are far too satisfied with being simply alive in Christ. We think if we can be sure that we have been born again we need not trouble ourselves any more. But that is a very poor idea of what Christ can do for us, and it is a very mistaken idea of what He expects of us. Who is content with a rose-bush that is simply alive? We expect it to produce roses. It is a tremendous blessing to know that we have passed from death unto life. But how can we even know that, if we are just alive and nothing more? John says, 'We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.' That is the rose-bush bearing roses. John is not satisfied with saying that we tolerate one another, or that we just manage to live with one another. He says the proof of our having passed from death unto life is that we love, *love* one another. And there is not a stronger word that he could use than that.

And we can only love by being rooted in Christ. We draw our nourishment from Him. And drawing our nourishment we grow in love.

3. The third and last use of the root is to *keep the plant in its place.* Trees are not easily blown down. When a tree is easily blown down you will notice that its roots run along the surface of the ground and do not go deep down into it. Trees have to be kept in their place, and the roots do that for them.

And we cannot leave Christ. We are rooted in Him and abide there. We may be tossed by tempests like a tree, sorrow or pain may come upon us, but as long as we are rooted in Christ these things are only blessings to us. We may not feel them so at the moment any more than the tree when it is being tossed by the wind may feel that it is all for its good, but, afterwards, we find that suffering and sorrow bring forth the fruits of righteousness in them that are exercised thereby.

When Thou dost dwell in me
And I in Thee
Then Thine own life through me doth flow
And in Thyself I live and grow.

The 'Two Natures' of our Lord.

By the Reverend W. J. Farley, B.D., Castlerock, Co. Londonderry.

'Christ is no single term, but in that name which is one is the signification both of Godhead and manhood. Wherefore Christ is called man, and Christ is called God, and Christ is both God and man, and Christ is One.'—Athanasius.

The Incarnation of our Lord has been defined as the meeting of Human and Divine. The word 'incarnation' is not found in the Scriptures, though the thought is there. Incarnation is entrance into flesh, and the term, like its Greek equivalent, was suggested by the opening words of Jn 1^{14}. The problem of the Person of Christ is a great mystery. We cannot do more than attempt to set down a few thoughts on some aspects of the discussion.

(*a*) The Witness of the N.T.

There are no traces of controversy in the N.T. concerning the Person of Christ. What we find is a development of thought about Him. The disciples of Jesus began with experience, and they went on to theory. They knew Him as One who went in and out amongst them, living a truly

human life. But during His life the presence of something more than human had been felt. Gradually those who watched Him were impelled to ask, 'What manner of man is this?', 'Who is this that forgiveth sins also?', and soon His friends were convinced that no other human being was like Him. After His death came the surprising events of His resurrection, then His ascension, and then the Day of Pentecost. On that day His disciples recognized Jesus as exalted to the right hand of God, and exerting divine power over men. Later on, higher thoughts of Christ were reached by Paul (Ph 2^{5-9}, 2 Co 8^{9}, Col 1^{15-17}, 1 Co 15^{20-28}), by the author of Hebrews (1^{1-4}), and by the author of the Fourth Gospel (1^{1-18}). These higher thoughts do not seem to have shocked the disciples who had lived and walked with Jesus, brought up though they were as strict monotheists. For instance, the First Epistle of Peter is evidence that the first disciples accepted Paul's doctrine of Christ; and we may doubt whether the Fourth Gospel—latest of the great N.T. writings and profoundest of the Gospels—would have been written had there not been already a widely accepted and well-established belief in the divine origin and incarnation of our Lord. We remember, also, that the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel take full account of the true humanity of Christ. It follows, then, that the early Christians could not have regarded the 'divinity' of Christ, to which they were led up, as the contradiction of His real humanity. They began, doubtless, to think of Him as a human being who had risen into divinity. They came afterwards to think of Him as a divine being who had descended into humanity (Grubb, *The Person of Christ in the N.T.*).

The Christians of the first three centuries were not greatly troubled with disputes concerning Christ's nature, but the fourth and fifth centuries were times of sharp controversy, which ended in a compromise at the Council of Chalcedon (451). The formula adopted by the Council was drawn up with a view to reconciling contending theological parties. It was not so much a theory of our Lord's Person as an armistice, if not a treaty of peace. It certainly averted disruption for a time, and it has survived as one of the historic expressions of the Christian Church to this day, and is embodied in many creeds and confessions. The result is—

(*b*) A Metaphysical View

of Christ's Person. Such expressions, however, as 'two distinct natures,' 'double nature,' require to be used with caution, else we shall be in danger of falling into the error of Nestorius, who holds the Divine and human natures so far apart as to make them virtually the seats of independent personalities. He was condemned at Chalcedon, and yet the formula adopted by the Council almost expressed his views, for it too starts from a view of God which cuts Him off from man as a Being of totally different nature. The fatal defect of these and other theories of our Lord's Person—Eutychianism, with its submerging of the human element in the Divine; Lutheranism, with its deification of human nature; and later Kenotic theories, with their 'watering-down' of the Divine Nature—is that they make a false start, namely, from a supposed fundamental opposition of the natures of God and man. The 'two natures' doctrine of the Person of Christ, in its traditional form, is not scriptural, and ought to be given up. The true starting-point in the study of Christ is the Biblical presupposition of the essential affinity of the Divine and human natures. By way of protest against metaphysical conceptions of our Lord's Person, recent thinkers have arrived at—

(*c*) A Psychological Theory

of 'two consciousnesses.' The theory has an advantage over the metaphysical theories in that it seeks a foothold in human experience, but otherwise it does not carry us much farther than the older theories. As by far the greater part of an iceberg, we are told, is hidden out of sight beneath the surface of the sea, so, according to this theory, by far the greater part of our mental life lies out of sight in the depths of our being, and what emerges above the threshold of consciousness is but a relatively small part of our mental possessions. From this it is concluded that our Lord lived, so to speak, in two universes at once—a smaller human sphere, and a vast subliminal sphere which, it is suggested, is the seat of the divine. All this is but diluted metaphysics, and, as far as Christ is concerned, pure assumption, the result being a psychological monstrosity. 'It is like saying that a man can be himself and his own elder brother, and then calling it a miracle'; the theory, in fact, destroys the

integrity of personality. The Gospel picture of Jesus reveals none of the 'jolts and jars' we might expect if, in Him, a human consciousness was unequally yoked with a divine, or if an 'uprush' of the divine occasionally invaded His *merely* human consciousness. He faces God with no trace of embarrassment, but with a continuous filial consciousness; and He faces men with the utmost naturalness, as a man and a brother. There is no trace, even in the Fourth Gospel, of any theory of a 'double nature,' if by that phrase we mean a being who was partly divine and partly human. The early disciples must have held—in so far as they thought the matter out—that God and man *have something in common*—"back in the eternities there was *somewhat* in God that afterwards became the Being 'found in fashion as a man,' and was called Jesus Christ." Paul and John trace back the earthly life of our Lord to its pre-existent point in the Godhead. Similarly, the writer to the Hebrews traces Christ from His original glory as Son (1^{1-4}), through His atoning work on earth, to glory again. But, throughout the N.T., we can see indications of only a single consciousness in Christ—a consciousness, however, which has had experience of, and retains in memory, two phases of existence. In the days of His flesh He remembered the glory which He had with the Father before the world was (Jn 17^5), and in His glorified life—

> 'He still remembers in the skies,
> His tears, His agonies, and cries' (cf. He 4^{15}).

For the sake of the ordinary man,

(*d*) A Simpler Conception

of the Person of Christ than that afforded by metaphysics or psychology is both desirable and possible.

The Incarnation was possible because God and man are alike. The Incarnation is not a division of God, nor did our Lord achieve manhood by a reduction of His deity—His impoverishment was not as to nature but as to personal experience. When we say that 'the Word became flesh' what we mean, says Olin A. Curtis, is that the eternal Son of God 'added to the original structural law of His being another law, namely, the law of a finite, dependent creature such as man is . . . so that the Incarnate Son of God has now two inherent capacities, one for divine experience, and the other for human experience.' Or more simply, to say that 'the Word became flesh' means that the Son of God became like us, became one of us. "Still we must ever remember that though he was in nature perfect man, He was not man in exactly the same sense in which any one of us is a man. Though man, He was not, strictly speaking, in the English sense of the word, *a* man; He was not such as one of us, and one out of a number. His Person was not human like ours, but divine. He who was from eternity continued one and the same, but with an addition. His Incarnation was 'a taking of the manhood unto God.' . . . He was not a man made God, but God made man" (*Newman*). "The phrase 'God and man' is of course perfectly true. But it is easy to lay undue emphasis on the 'and.' . . . He is not so much God *and* man as God in, through, and as man" (*Moberly*). His Humanity "was not merely the Humanity of a finite creature, but the Humanity of the Infinite God" (*ibid.*).

To sum up. Humanity, as we know it, is not complete. "It is not so correct to say that Jesus Christ was Divine and *yet* human, as to say He was Divine and *therefore* human" (T. B. Kilpatrick: art. 'Incarnation,' *DCG* i. 813). As soon as we see that Godhead and manhood are not antithetical but complementary, "we see how we may reach a simple, thinkable conception of the Person of Christ. Is He man? Then what is man? Man at his highest and best is the Lord Jesus Christ. Is He God? Then what is God? God is simply the highest and best that we can conceive of man, and that again is the Lord Jesus Christ. To separate the God from the man in Christ, and say *this* He did as God, and *that* as man, is to do violence, not only to Christ, but to our own thinking. For we cannot think of Christ (if we think of Him truly) without thinking of God; and we cannot think of God (if we think of Him truly) without thinking of Christ" (The Expository Times, November 1916). He is the 'image' of God; the Divine glory is revealed 'in the face of Jesus Christ.' He is the 'image' also of the perfect man, into which Christians are being transformed (cf. 2 Co 4^{4-6} with 2 Co 3^{18}; and Col 1^{15} with Col 3^{10}). Perhaps, then, we might venture to say, with all reverence, that the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, so far from being a stupendous miracle, is the most supremely natural event in the whole history of the relations between God and man.

Contributions and Comments.

Q's Eschatology: A Study of Luke xvii. 20-37.

On p. 424 of *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Streeter adumbrates the position, which he works out in the essay that follows, that in the synoptic gospels there are three well-marked stages of eschatological development; namely, Q, in which there is least eschatology; Mark, in which there is more; and Matthew, in which there is most. On p. 433 he suggests that the words of Jesus as they appear in Q may be a modification, in accordance with this tendency, of the words actually spoken by Our Lord. A study of this present passage from St. Luke strikingly confirms both of these positions.

I. The parallels in Matthew to this Lukan passage show that Mt. has enhanced the eschatological nature of his source. Thus:

Lk 17^{24}, So shall the Son of Man be	*becomes* in Mt 24^{27},	So shall be *the coming* (παρουσία) of the Son of Man.
Lk 17^{26}, So shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man	*becomes* in Mt 24^{37} and also in Mt 24^{39},	So shall be *the coming* (παρουσία) of the Son of Man.

II. This Lukan passage (17^{22-37}) is an eschatological development of a prophecy of Jesus of the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans. In other words, it is possible, in this instance, to go behind an eschatological passage in Q to a non-eschatological discourse of Jesus. There is general agreement that much of this passage is from Q, though there is not agreement as to the amount. Thus B. Weiss and Streeter assign the whole to Q; Wendt and Holtzmann, all but 20^{21}; Wellhausen, all but 37; while Allen, Harnack, Hawkins and J. Weiss differ slightly from one another in assigning smaller portions to this source. The present writer regards Streeter's arguments on p. 201 f. (Essay VI.) of *O.S.S.P.* as successfully proving that our whole passage is 'obviously a solid piece of Q.' We are now to go behind our Q passage to the original words of Jesus, and it is remarkable that the alterations required to change its main drift entirely are so few—a fact which is of importance in estimating their probability.

First we must remove vv.$^{23.25}$ as secondary. The former, v.^{23}, seems to be founded on v.^{21}; and the latter, v.^{25}, is merely an echo of the thought expressed in Mk 8^{31}, Mt 16^{21}, Lk 9^{22}. This brings vv.$^{22.24}$ together, and gives to each a natural and striking meaning. V.^{22} means The days will come when you will desire the opportunities which My earthly life affords you (cp. Jn $7^{33.34}$), but you will be too late, for (v.^{24}) My earthly career is meteoric as a lightning flash. If these verses are not removed, an eschatological meaning must be forced on v.^{22}, and v.^{24} must be interpreted (with Plummer) to mean The Coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven will be 'as sudden and as universally visible' as a lightning flash.

Next, there is one slight change necessary, and there are one or two others probable. In v.^{30} we must alter ἧ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται to ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the phrase which occurs in v.^{26}. The two objections that may be raised to this change appear to be ill-founded. The first is that it is unlikely that the plural ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις would be followed by the singular ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in the next clause. But, as a matter of fact, the meaning of the two clauses would be different, and the change from plural to singular natural; ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις meaning, In the generation of the Son of Man though after His death, and ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ meaning, In the day when the calamity occurs. An alternative alteration is to read ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. This change, however, has the disadvantage of being out of line with the parallel in v.^{26}, which is guaranteed by the parallels ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε (v.^{26}), and ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ (v.^{28}). Its advantages are very problematical. The first is that it is a smaller alteration: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ being nearer ἧ ἡμέρᾳ than is ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις. But we are dealing here, not with accidental errors but intentional changes, and if our theory of eschatological editing holds good, the editor must needs have the singular, whatever was his original text, if he is to refer to the παρουσία. Another illusory advantage is that ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ gives us the

sing. both in v.[30] and also in the next clause in v.[31]; but as the two phrases, as we have seen, have different meanings, there is nothing unnatural in the juxtaposition of plural and singular. The third advantage, that it brings the clause into line with WHm. *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνου* in v.[24], is equally illusory. Probably *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ* in v.[24] (marg.) is a spurious reading inserted in accordance with the eschatological meaning that the passage has assumed. V.[24] is seen to be better without it when we realize its true meaning.

Another probable but not necessary change is *τοὺς μαθητάς* in v.[22] to *αὐτούς*. It would be natural for the eschatological editor to change *αὐτούς* to *τοὺς μαθητάς* (cp. Mk 13[3], *κατ' ἰδίαν*, and Streeter, *O.S.S.P.*, p. 180). If the original reading was *αὐτούς*, then the whole discourse was addressed to the Pharisees, and its point is that the growth of Zealotism among them, producing a feverish expectation of a political messiah, will result in the destruction of the Jewish state.

Perhaps the most interesting point in this passage emerges in v.[33]. This verse is not apposite to its present context. Jesus's point is not that a man must be prepared to lose his life, but that to save it he must be prepared to lose his possessions. The situation is that of a sudden local catastrophe, such as an invasion, in which nothing but prompt flight can avail. This is clearly shown by v.[31], which cannot possibly have an eschatological meaning; for what man who saw the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven 'as sudden and as universally visible' (Plummer, *I.C.C.* on 17[24]) as a lightning flash—the meaning v.[24] must have in its *present* context—would think of returning from roof or field to secure his goods? Perhaps this verse is a misunderstanding of an Aramaic original under the influence of the similar saying in 9[24], Mt 16[25], Mk 8[35], etc. Perhaps Jesus used the word חַיִּין in the two senses 'life' and 'necessaries of life,' *i.e.* possessions. Whosoever shall seek to get his חַיִּין (necessaries of life = possessions) shall lose his חַיִּין (= life); but whosoever shall lose them (חַיִּין = possessions), shall save it (חַיִּין = life). The use of *περιποιήσασθαι* in this verse also points in this direction. Souter, in *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek N.T.*, seems to find its use here a difficulty, for he says 'in Lk 17[33], perhaps, *I preserve alive*.' (The use of *εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς* in He 10[39] is different.) With such an object as 'possessions,' however, its use is natural.

The only question is whether this secondary sense of חַיִּין can be substantiated. It does not occur in Syriac or Biblical Aramaic. It does occur, however, in Biblical Hebrew and the Talmud. Thus חַיִּים, which commonly means 'life,' means also 'maintenance' in Pr 27[27], 'sustenance in Jg 6[4], and 'victuals' in Jg 17[10]. Buxtorf (*Lex. Chald. Talm. Rabb.*, *sv.* חַיִּין, חַיִּים) says with reference to Baba Metzia 71a, Ktb. 50a, Joma 75a, 'Sic sumitur pro alimentis sivi mediis et artibus, quibus vita sustentatur.' In Jastrow's dictionary חַיֵּי נַפְשׁ is said to mean 'necessaries of life' (Y. Ned. ix. 42c, 'washing clothes belongs to the necessaries of life'), and Kidd. 28a, יורד עמו (עד) לְחַיָּיו ('descendere aliquo in vitam eius'), is quoted as meaning, 'persecutes him so far as to deprive him of his livelihood.'

JAMES T. HUDSON.

Ashton-under-Lyne.

Note on Acts xiii. 42.

AMONG the few passages in the N.T. in which Westcott and Hort admit the possibility of a primitive error, is Ac 13[42]. The preceding verses have given us the concluding sentences of Paul's lengthy address in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia; and the historian continues:

ἐξιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλουν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα:

and that the difficulty of this construction was early felt is shown by the fact that many MSS. substitute, for *αὐτῶν*, *τῶν ἰουδαίων*, others *τῶν ἀποστόλων*. The important Laudian MS. (E), assigned to the sixth century, omits *παρεκάλουν* and inserts *ἠξίουν* before *λαληθῆναι*. This in all probability suggested to Hort his conjecture that for *ἐξιόντων* we should read *ἀξιούντων* and omit *παρεκάλουν*. Unquestionably this change to a great extent relieves the difficulty; for, if we alter the full stop after *ταῦτα* to a comma, and run straight on into the next verse, the harshness of the 'unattached participle' is much softened. But the question still remains as to how *παρεκάλουν* came to be inserted.

The solution I would suggest is that *παρεκάλουν*

is a corruption of παρ' Ἀμβακούμ (or perhaps παρ' Ἀβακούμ—a possible form)—*i.e.* 'from Habakkuk': originally a sidenote to the effect that the quotation in v.[41], with which Paul's speech ends, was made from that prophet. Imagine the MS. to have run thus:

ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται
Παρ' Ἀβακούμ
ὑμῖν ἀξιούντων δὲ αὐτῶν,

and the rest becomes easy.

I can find no exact parallel to this use of παρά to denote the taking of a quotation from an author. The usual phrase is τὸ Πλάτωνος, τὸ Ὁμήρου, or the like; though I find in Origen ἀπὸ Πλάτωνος εἰρῆσθαι. But Mk 8[11] 12[2] 16[9], 2 P 1[17] seem to justify such an expression; and if it was rare, that would be only another reason why the copyist should be puzzled by it.

E. E. Kellett.

Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

The Egyptian Discoveries and the *ERE*

A thrill of pleasure, as Sir E. Wallis Budge said, went through the whole of the archæological world at the news of the discovery by Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Howard Carter of the Tomb of King Tut-ankh-Amen in the lonely Valley of the Kings near Luxor, the news of which came from Egypt on November 29th.

Together Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Carter forced open a hitherto concealed door in the rock, descended some sixteen steps to an underground chamber, and saw there all the furniture connected with the elaborate ritual of the sepulchre of a king in Egypt some 3000 years ago. The eyes of A.D. 1922 looked on the furniture of a king's palace of 1350 B.C.! There were three magnificent State coaches, all gilt with exquisite carving, the work of Egyptian artificers of that far-off age. On these rested beds, beautifully carved, all gilt and inlaid with ivory and precious stones. There were also innumerable boxes of exquisite workmanship. Beneath one of the coaches was the State throne of the king, 'one of the most beautiful objects of art ever discovered.' As Professor Flinders Petrie has pointed out, the throne is specially important from the archæological point of view, as it is the first example which has been found. In our estimate of the value of the present discovery, it should not be forgotten that our information about the customs and beliefs of ancient Egypt has come largely through the work of patient excavators. It is through their burial customs that we have been able to reconstruct Egyptian life. The case of Greece and Rome is different. Our information there has come chiefly from literary descriptions and painting. We wait now with intense interest the opening of the further chambers in which it is hoped the body of King Tutankhamen will be found.

Those who have the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics at command will find in it, in that remarkable and most illuminating series of articles on 'Death and Disposal of the Dead,' and more particularly in the Egyptian article by Mr. H. R. Hall, M.A., F.R.G.S., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, a great deal of light on the meaning of this notable discovery. 'Of no other country in the world,' Mr. Hall writes, 'have the burial customs always attracted so much attention as have those of ancient Egypt. The artificial preservation of the body, the elaborate care with which it was provided with covering and ornament, the monumental nature of the tombs which were built or excavated to contain it, struck the earliest foreign observers with astonishment, and are still the theme of wonder and admiration in our own day. Moreover, the dry and microbe-free climate of Egypt, in which nothing is destroyed by the disintegrating action of the atmosphere or the attacks of bacilli, has helped the artificial aids of mummification and carefully-sealed burial to preserve the human body and its appurtenances intact just as they were placed in the tomb.'

The artificial preservation of the body is the chief peculiarity of Egyptian burial customs. 'No doubt,' says Mr. Hall, 'in later times a theory of resurrection was adopted, according to which, after a space of three thousand years, the several parts of a man—his *ikhu*, or spark of intelligence which had rejoined the gods, his *ba*, or bird-like

soul which fluttered around the tomb, his *khaibit*, or shadow, and the *ka*, or double of him, which was born with him and accompanied him on earth during life and in the tomb during death—rejoined his *sahu*, or noble and venerable mummy, which had lain so long in solitary majesty in the tomb, and then the whole man rose again from the dead. But it is not clear that this actual man was to live again on earth as he had lived before. He was to live with the gods rather.' After 3000 years!

This is not the only Egyptian theory of Resurrection given by Mr. Hall.

SOME TEXTS.

Gal. iv. 4, 5.

'That all men are sons of God "by nature" in the sense that they are sons of God in their true essential being, that divine sonship is the birthright of all men, is undoubtedly true. It is a truth too often neglected by theology, and strongly emphasized by Frederick W. Robertson and by Phillips Brooks. But in their actual, "natural" condition, the divine sonship is undeveloped and unrealized, and needs to be quickened into full reality by the power of Christ.'

'The fundamental difference between Christ and other men lies in His power to create a new humanity in His image, after His likeness. If we ever get to be *like* Him, it will be *through* Him. Christ is the creative source of Christlikeness. The nearer we attain to Him, the more fully shall we know His unique power to make us so to attain. His Divine Sonship brings to us also the power to become sons of God. In theological language He is the Son of God "by nature," while we are the sons of God "by adoption and grace," the adoption and grace that come through Him.' [1]

2 Cor. iii. 17.

'The question is whether St. Paul in 2 Co 3^{17}, "the Lord is the Spirit," *identifies* Christ the Lord in heaven with the Holy Spirit, contrary, as I have said, to his constant custom of distinguishing them. I think it is very difficult to suppose this, and the passage seems to me to suggest a quite different interpretation. According to the MSS., it runs (v.[16]): "But whensoever the children of Israel shall turn to the Lord, [referring to Ex 34^{34}] the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, *there* is liberty." Here the sudden transition from the Lord who is the Spirit to the Spirit of the Lord, followed by another transition in the next verse back again to "the Lord the Spirit," seems to me to be so awkward as to make eminently probable the minute emendation of the text proposed by Dr. Hort and Dr. Chase (an emendation which only involves the change of u into v), according to which we should read, "whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit is Lord, there is liberty. And we all . . . reflecting the glory of the Lord, are being transformed . . . as from the Lord the Spirit." Here St. Paul no doubt in some sense calls the Spirit the Lord. But I have come to be convinced that it is in this sense: "The Lord to whom Israel must turn is the Spirit [*i.e.* the Holy Spirit now given to the true Israel in the Christian Church]. Only where that Spirit is Lord is real liberty, and it is in the power of this Spirit-Lord that we Christians are being transformed." It is true that St. Paul does not elsewhere call the Spirit Lord, but I think he is led to do so here by the suggestion of the narrative in Exodus: and it appears to me that there is no violence or improbability involved in this supposition, namely, that as St. Paul constantly calls the Father the Lord, and Jesus Christ the Lord, so once he should have called the Holy Spirit the Lord—for obviously He is Lord in Christian souls in the same sense as the Father and as Jesus. This seems to me much more intelligible than that St. Paul should confuse Christ and the Spirit by saying "the Lord Jesus is the Spirit," while he elsewhere so clearly and constantly distinguishes them.' [2]

2 Cor. v. 16.

'It is difficult to feel sure what exactly St. Paul means by the words, "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him *so* no more." He is speaking, in a measure, generally of the ambassadors for Christ, not only of himself. That is (in part) the force of the plural "we." He is describing how the appreciation of the love of Christ involves for them death to their selfish selves, and to all the narrowness of natural affections. "To know men after the

[1] E. S. Drown, *The Creative Christ*, 126, 125.

[2] C. Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 254.

flesh" is to appraise them according to the standards of class, or race, or disposition. To "know Christ after the flesh" would be to appreciate Him as a Jew would naturally appreciate Him, as the Heaven-sent Messenger who is to exalt the Jewish race and minister to Jewish pride. St. Paul had felt this pride in Christ, but before he recognized Jesus as the Christ. What he seems to mean is that all such narrow and partial prejudices have been abolished by the expulsive power of a love which is spiritual and universal.'[1]

SOME TOPICS.

The Fear of Goodness.

'There was a day when men feared to look within themselves lest they discovered the hidden deeps of their own depravity: but there is a fear in the hearts of many men lest looking within they discover their own goodness. For the undeveloped goodness of man is revolutionizing. It is the custom among those whose business it is to write on this subject to emphasize the fears that arise from a man's misdeeds, from some moral blunder in his past, from the nervous effects of dismal and degrading experiences; but surely something needs to be said about this other very prevalent form of fear, the fear of goodness—a fear of following the implications of an innate goodness in the lives of men; a fear of living up to the highest that one knows. Were we to follow all the best promptings of our better nature, it is not difficult to imagine ourselves aloof, alone, and pedestalled above the level of the world; and in the lives of most of us there is a dread of being alone—especially of being morally alone.'

This quotation is from *The Shining Highway*, by E. G. Miles, M.A. (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). The book contains Mr. Miles' view of life, and every chapter should be read.

The Price of Noise.

'The life of the city dweller lacks solitude, silence, ease. The nights are noisy and ablaze. The people of a big city are assaulted by incessant sound, now violent and jagged, now falling into unfinished rhythms, but endless and remorseless. Under modern industrialism thought goes on in a bath of noise. If its discriminations are often flat and foolish, here at least is some part of the reason. The sovereign people determines life and death and happiness under conditions where experience and experiment alike show thought to be most difficult. "The intolerable burden of thought" is a burden when the conditions make it burdensome. It is no burden when the conditions are favourable. It is as exhilarating to think as to dance, and just as natural. Every man whose business it is to think knows that he must for part of the day create about himself a pool of silence. But, in that helter-skelter which we flatter by the name of civilization, the citizen performs the perilous task of government under the worst possible conditions. A faint recognition of this truth inspires the movement for a shorter workday, for longer vacations, for light, air, order, sunlight and dignity in factories and offices. But if the intellectual quality of our life is to be improved, that is only the merest beginning. So long as so many jobs are an endless, and, for the worker, an aimless routine, a kind of automatism using one set of muscles in one monotonous pattern, his whole life will tend towards an automatism in which nothing is to be particularly distinguished from anything else unless it is announced like a thunderclap. So long as he is physically imprisoned in crowds by day, and even by night, his attention will flicker and relax. It will not hold fast and define clearly where he is the victim of all sorts of pother, in a home which needs to be ventilated of its welter of drudgery, shrieking children, raucous assertions, indigestible food, bad air, and suffocating ornaments. Occasionally, perhaps, we enter a building which is composed and spacious; we go to a theatre where modern stagecraft has cut away distractions, or go to sea, or into a quiet place, and we remember how cluttered, how capricious, how superfluous, and clamorous is the ordinary urban life of our time. We learn to understand why our addled minds seize so little with precision, why they are caught up and tossed about in a kind of tarantella by headlines and catchwords, why so often they cannot tell things apart, or discern identity in apparent differences.'[2]

The Three Ways of Christ.

'There are, in fact, three relations in which our Lord stands to us in the New Testament. There is Christ *in front of us*, who sets before us the standard of the new life—in whom we see the true meaning of manhood. That is to kindle our desire. Then there is *Christ for us*—our propitiation or atonement—winning for us, at the price of His blood-shedding, freedom from all the guilt and bondage of the past, the assurance of free forgiveness and the fresh start. Then there is *Christ in us*—our new life by the Spirit, moulding us inwardly into His likeness, and conforming us to His character. And the three are one. Each is unintelligible without the others. The redeeming work of Christ lies in all together. We may dwell now on one and now on the other, but we can never really isolate one from the others without

[1] C. Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 105.

[2] W. Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 72.

altogether distorting the meaning even of the one.'[1]

The Coming Type of Christianity.

'I think that many [missionaries] agree with me that already a nobler form of Christianity is being produced on Asiatic soil than that which we have brought thither, and it may well be in the providence of God that a new and splendid era in Church history is opening up as those responsive and religious peoples of the Orient are captured by the Gospel of Christ. In spite of the failures of Christendom and of our divided Christianity the whole of Asia reverences the historic Jesus, and from her contact with His spirit is at once reforming and revivifying her ancient faiths. This process is of immense significance, and her best spirits even when they do not call themselves Christians are frank to confess how much they owe to Him, and how much there is in their old faiths which will need to die in order that they may live again, purified and deepened. That Asia is increasingly becoming Christian in its standards of thought and conduct is evident to any unbiased observer, and one of the most remarkable proofs of the authenticity and originality of our faith is this—that it is at once reforming and fulfilling the ancient faiths of Asia. What it did with the religions of Rome and Greece it is already doing with the nobler religions of the Orient: and true missionaries of Christ are at work upon a task of incomparable dignity and splendour.'[2]

Auto-suggestion and Religion.

The Rev. H. C. Carter, M.A., preached two sermons on Auto-suggestion in Emmanuel Congregational Church, Cambridge, in July and August of this year. They have now been published—*Auto-Suggestion and Religion* (Heffer; 1s.).

Mr. Carter is chiefly concerned to trace the relation of auto-suggestion to religion. He is struck by the way in which the things which M. Coué says chime in with, and even echo, things which occur in New Testament teaching. 'For instance,' M. Coué says: 'Be sure that you will obtain what you want, and you will obtain it, so long as it is within reason.' 'What Christian,' Mr. Carter asks, 'can read that without being reminded of what Jesus said: "Whatsoever you ask in prayer, believe that you have received it"? And the last phrase in the sentence, "within reason," if we pursue the thought of Jesus' teaching, recalls what He tells us in word and in His example about holding all our requests in subordination to the will of God. "Nevertheless, not my will but thine be done!" "Thy will be done," He told us to say when we begin to pray. Perhaps "within reason" is only a Coué'ism for "what is within the will of God." For God's will is the "reason" of the universe.'

Has Mr. Carter no criticism of auto-suggestion then? 'In the end,' he says, 'I believe that it will be found that its method, in so far as it lays hold of and appropriates these truths, is not rightly *auto*-suggestion. If I were to coin some more of these ugly hybrid words I should say it would be found that the real name for it was *Theo*-suggestion or *Christo*-suggestion. It is to God, the God who is made known in all the fullness of His sympathy and oneness with man in Christ, the God whose will is all human health and goodness, that we appeal when we claim with confidence as already ours the good we need for body or for mind.'

NEW POETRY.

Fay Inchfawn.

Ward, Lock & Co. have published another volume of Fay Inchfawn's poems. *The Verse-Book of a Homely Woman*, and *Verses of a House-Mother* are now followed by *Homely Verses of a Home-Lover* (2s. 6d. net). You see the insistence on the 'home.' They are not all poems of the home, it is true, but they sing most sweetly and truly when they are. And sometimes they are also prayers of the home.

'Mother, I'm Coming!'

I heard you, Sweet! And I'll prepare,
So lovingly, your dainty wear.
Oh, I will dream, and scheme, each day;
And, planning, put the pence away.
Then, too, not only will I make
Soft woolly comforts for your sake;
But I will fashion, if I can,
Fine raiment for your inner man.
I will not think on evil things,
Lest I should clip my darling's wings.
I'll set my heart to understand
The great salvation God has planned.
Yes, every atom of my being,
All feeling; tasting; hearing; seeing;
He shall refine; and garnish, too.
I'll be God's woman, through and through.
'Lord, take me. And, if this may be,
Possess my little child through me!'

[1] C. Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 299.
[2] Saunders, *Buddhism in the Modern World*, p. iv.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Can we determine and define the Essence of Christianity? This is a question that has been handled by nearly every notable writer who in the last century has discussed the claims of the Christian religion. It is raised by the suggestion that there are elements in the developed Christian faith which are not necessarily part of it, and by the results of comparative religion which compel us to declare in what respect the Christian faith differs from others. Harnack devoted a book to the question. Loisy followed suit. Troeltsch contributes to the discussion. Quite recently Principal Jacks settled the matter confidently in his book on 'Religious Perplexities.' And now Principal Galloway devotes a long essay to it in his new work *Religion and Modern Thought* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net).

Dr. Galloway is Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, and a recognized authority in philosophic thought. His book contains a series of discussions of problems raised by modern thinking in reference to religion. The unsettlement of the time is in his mind throughout, and perplexed souls will find in him a very competent guide on many difficult questions. He writes with a sure grasp and out of profound knowledge, and his thinking is so clear and so plainly expressed that his book will be read with unalloyed pleasure. One of the most interesting essays is on 'The Essence of Christianity.'

Harnack thought the question was a purely historical one, and went back to the origins. What was the gospel of Jesus Himself? To find this you must eliminate Paul and the Fourth Gospel. The answer lies in the Synoptic Gospels, and the answer is: the Fatherhood of God, with its associated doctrines of the sonship of man, the infinite value of the soul, and the righteousness of the kingdom. This is the living core of Christianity. The key that unlocks the door is Simplification.

Is this answer sound? Loisy answers No. He points out that Harnack leaves out what to the mind of Jesus was essential—the eschatological element. Harnack's Christ is not the Christ of history, but of Liberal Protestantism. Besides, the problem is not merely a historical one. In history there are no bare 'facts.' It is values that move human wills and are the real forces in historic development. Finally, it is not practicable to answer our question by going back to the origins. Christ's consciousness is not quite the same thing as historic Christianity. You have to seek that in the consciousness of His followers, in what Christ was to them. The faith of Christians is not the faith of Christ, but faith *in* Christ, which was embodied in definite conceptions of His person and worth.

Is Loisy's view any truer? For him the religious

beliefs of Christ are not the essential thing, but the living evolution of the Church's faith and doctrine to meet the changing needs of a changing world. Hence the essential is the expansive spiritual life of the Church ever embodying itself in fresh forms.

This, however, is even more open to criticism than Harnack's answer. For it cuts the tree loose from the root, Christian development from the historic life from which it sprang. Christ becomes little more than a symbol in His religion. It is a precarious principle to lay down that what is really valuable in Christianity is essential, for 'it is notorious that different persons make very different valuations of the same object.'

Can we not find an answer, then, to our question: What is Christianity? Well, we cannot, in so many words. Christianity is a great Gift of God to the world. Every age sees in it something of the truth. Christian history is a progressive vision of the supreme good. 'Each age brings something of its own to the interpretation of the Christian Religion, and expresses its faith in terms of the values which are immanent in its own life.' The essence of Christianity can reveal itself only as it is taken up into and vivified by the life of each successive age.

The real problem is not that of essence, but the question of gaining an insight into the broad principles or factors which distinguish the Christian outlook on the world and life. And these are obvious: first, the place of Christ in Christianity; second, the nature of Christianity as a redemptive religion; and, finally, the existence of a transcendent world wherein man's destiny lies.

The written sermons of Dr. ORCHARD are always welcome. We say 'written' advisedly, for these sermons are packed so full of thought that they must be sometimes difficult for the hearer. Dr. ORCHARD himself says that he has selected the sermons found in his new volume, 'some because they were liked by those who heard them, and some because they were not.' This new volume is called *No More War* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The title is taken from the last sermon in the volume.

But let us turn to the second sermon. It is called the 'Consciousness of Christ.' The consciousness of Christ interests Dr. ORCHARD because it is, he says, the ultimate court of appeal concerning Christ's Divinity.

Dr. ORCHARD is well aware that the appeal to Christ's consciousness may lead to an impasse. He does not build his argument for Jesus' Divinity on any passages in the Fourth Gospel, or even in the Synoptics, in which the consciousness of Jesus would appear to be directly revealed. His object is to find some ground which would not be denied even by those critics of the Synoptics whose process of throwing doubt on everything which seems to make too direct a claim of Divinity is carried, according to Dr. ORCHARD, to such an extent that 'no argument is possible because everything is suspected which can be used to support Christ's divinity precisely for that reason.'

What does Dr. ORCHARD make his starting-point, then? He starts from those passages in which the consciousness of Jesus is only indirectly revealed. He even goes further, and builds upon those sayings of Jesus which seem to contradict the received estimates of what His consciousness includes or supports.

Dr. ORCHARD asks in the first place what we can infer about the Divinity of Christ from Jesus' clear consciousness of God. Jesus Christ, he says, speaks with assurance about God, His utterances in this way being markedly different from those of the prophets. 'He does not preface His utterances with, "Thus saith the Lord God": there is no arguing of His authority to speak for God; it is

assumed without claim or argument. And on the other hand we find not the slightest dubiety about the ways of God which even the greatest theologians have always confessed.' These utterances do not point to a knowledge of God acquired through experience or by reflexion. Christ's knowledge about God everywhere bears the mark of immediate intuition. His knowledge of God belongs to Him because of what He is.

There is one saying which expressly distinguishes between Jesus' knowledge and the knowledge which the Father has. ' "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Although this is one of those negative texts to which we are to be allowed to ascribe the greatest value because they appear to contradict the prevailing opinion, yet the very distinction only serves to enforce the point of Christ's unique knowledge.' The text puts the Son not only above men, but above the angels, and thus indirectly and by the way claims for Him a unique place.

Dr. ORCHARD turns next for a proof of Jesus' Divinity to indirect revelations of His consciousness of Himself. He deals with Jesus' conception of Himself as the Messiah; but leaving this aside, his two examples are Jesus' unconsciousness of sin and the high-handed manner in which He rescinds the Mosaic law. Dr. ORCHARD says there is 'no word to show that Jesus had the slightest consciousness of sin. This marks Him off in a most significant way not only from the rest of mankind, but from the most saintly among men; for the higher man rises in actual goodness the more he is aware of how much he falls short. And there is no word from the lips of Jesus that ever suggests that He came to this condition of mind through a stage of penitence and subsequent assurance of forgiveness.'

On Jesus' attitude to the Mosaic Law, Dr. ORCHARD says that His direct claims to be greater than Solomon or Jonah are 'themselves indirectly surpassed when, without either defence or apology, He rescinds the Mosaic Law with the simple but majestic claim, "but I say unto you."'

Dr. ORCHARD's third argument for Jesus' Divinity is got from His own sense of His relationship to mankind. Jesus' demands, he points out, for man's love and attachment go beyond anything which family or country can claim: men must be prepared to forsake all and to risk their lives in following Him. But in Jesus' interview with the rich young ruler Dr. ORCHARD finds something which goes even beyond that. The rich young ruler 'had asked what he should do to inherit eternal life; there is enumerated in reply the second half of the decalogue; to this there is added the surrender of his riches, and this only as the final condition of following Jesus. That is to say, eternal salvation depends ultimately upon relation to Christ. If one asks why there is no enunciation of the first half of the decalogue, the only possible answer is that Christ has put loyalty to Himself in its place. And this indirect claim is supported by the explicit declaration that men's confession now will determine His owning them before His Father.'

Building up his argument further, Dr. ORCHARD quotes Jesus' invitation to men to come to Him, because He can give them rest, as a promise of something which it is agreed none but God can do —which is only emphasized if Jesus is consciously borrowing from the invitation of Wisdom in the Apocrypha.

Professor J. A. FINDLAY of Manchester has followed up his previous studies with a remarkable book on *The Realism of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It professes to be a paraphrase and exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, but it is much more. It is a sincere, suggestive, and original presentation of the mind of Jesus, and of the historical environment that makes it intelligible. The book makes the same impression on the mind as did Glover's 'Jesus of History' and McFadyen's

'Jesus and Life,' an impression of intense reality, as though the writer had got inside the thought and 'worn it next his skin.'

Professor FINDLAY faces the question: How can we observe the injunctions of the Sermon on the Mount? He has been handling the difficult passage about turning the other cheek and going a second mile. So far as the *meaning* of these injunctions goes, the writer thinks it is very much this, that everything in social life depends on restoring the right human relationship, the only terms on which men can live together, and this can best be done in such cases as Jesus mentions by a surrender of personal rights. We can discourage the will to wound the feelings of a brother-man by ignoring an insult: 'for rudeness soon tires if it is not noticed; it lives by seeing itself resented.'

This will sufficiently indicate the line of Professor FINDLAY'S exposition. It does not do much to make the injunctions easier. It does not explain them away. It makes them as hard as ever. But then comes the question: Where is the power that can make possible this single-minded and generous attitude Jesus has been describing? The answer of this book is a striking one. It is very much this, that our inability to carry out the teaching of Jesus is due, not to lack of piety, but to the fact that we are not *human* enough; and what brings the human into exercise and thus binds us all together is love for Jesus.

We are not human enough. We surround ourselves with abstractions like nationality, federations, trade unions, and these hide from us our common humanity. Human trustfulness and reasonable good nature would carry the fabric of society along. But we erect these barriers between classes and individuals and forget what is common to us all. What we need is to be simply human and *naturally* human. The idea of a Christian who is openly insulted remembering in the nick of time the verse about non-resistance, and, with an expression of saintly resignation, turning the other cheek, is not the idea of Jesus.

This sense of our common humanity comes to us when we learn to love Jesus truly. What does 'truly' mean? Well, look at the disciples. Jesus was to them at first a peculiar possession. They saw God in Him, but He was still outside them. They were spectators, and were for ever quarrelling as to which of them could get most out of Him. Then, because they were divided, they failed Him in the hour of His need, and their very failure brought them at last into a fellowship. When their private hopes and prejudices had all been forgotten, He came back to them, but only to tell them that He was theirs for ever on condition that they shared Him with all the nations.

This was the fellowship of His Holy Spirit. The disciples discovered that all kinds of people could share their experience of Jesus, and human nature became a new thing because He revealed Himself in it. That is the bond that unites us to all men, that at any moment we may see Christ in them. To see this is to be human, to live it is to be *naturally* human. And we come to this by the love of Jesus, not as our own possession, but as the possession of all sorts of people. Nothing is too good to hope for in each other, and nothing too hard to do for each other.

And so the Gospel goes further back than 'get right with God,' or even 'get right with your fellow-men.' Its essential message is 'get right with Jesus, and your love for Him will make you brave and simple enough to get right with man.'

Psycho-analysis is for the moment all the rage. Its literature is issuing from the Press in a steady stream. It means something of which account has to be taken. As to how much it means, judgment may well be held in suspense for a time. We can only 'wait and see.'

What interests us here is the statement, repeated by many writers, that psycho-analysis is bound to modify moral and religious doctrine. Is this merely another example of the familiar case of those who are enthusiastic over a new discovery in one department of study imagining that all departments of thought must thereby be profoundly affected? One may complain that so many writers should confidently predict a modification of religious doctrine without indicating fairly definitely what sort of transformation is in their minds. Does it amount to a revolution, or is it merely a change of emphasis? We have a right to be informed.

We apprehend that in all probability what certain writers on psycho-analysis have in their mind when they speak of a modification of religious doctrine is a modification of Christian ethics. We cannot see what else it can be. Admittedly the teaching of the new psychology, that 'repressions' are dangerous to physical or mental health or to both, does seem to bear hardly on what is in many quarters supposed to be the Christian doctrine of renunciation and self-denial. In his recent book, 'A Study in Moral Problems,' Mr. B. M. Laing acknowledges the force of this new argument in favour of self-interest, and to all appearance he finds it unanswerable.

The first remark to be made is this. Psycho-analysts are far from being the first to cast doubt upon the value of renunciation as an ideal. To mention no others, Spencer argued the point very well in his 'Data of Ethics.' We doubt if the new considerations adduced from the analysis of pathological and abnormal cases make the argument very much stronger.

Our second point is this. Renunciation is not at all the Christian ideal, as we find if we go for our conceptions of what Christianity teaches, not to the hermitage, but to the New Testament. What needs to be changed is not the New Testament, but the 'monkish' ethics. The latter is held unfortunately by many to whom the very word 'monk' is anathema. On the other hand, it is fortunately held in very few monasteries. For the Western Church in particular was, on the whole, wise enough to see that the goal to be aimed at was not 'repression' but 'sublimation' of egoistic desires. And that is precisely what psycho-analysts are now proclaiming as though it were a new discovery.

That self-repression is a true end in itself, that in itself and for its own sake it is either good or likely to lead to good, is nowhere taught by Jesus or Paul. So much is the contrary the case that 'superaltruists' have criticised the Christian Ethic as a thinly disguised egoism. They have found fault with the rule 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' They are almost shocked to find the writer of Hebrews saying that Jesus endured the Cross 'for the joy that was set before him' and counselling His followers to be like Him in that. They have some doubt about our Lord's question, 'What shall it profit a man . . . if he lose himself?'

True, there is the saying, 'let him deny himself,' etc., but it must surely be read in the light of other sayings, where the self-denial is conditioned by such words as 'for my sake,' or is inculcated as the necessary step towards a fuller self-realization.

The Christian doctrine of self-denial has no doubt been often expressed in sermons and in hymns in such a way as to make criticism pertinent, just as has been the case with the doctrine of contentment with one's lot. What we complain of, however, is that psycho-analysts and others seem to confuse the real Christian teaching with popular misunderstandings of it.

'You call yourselves sinners. That is blasphemy. You are Gods! . . . When I see a young mother bending over her child I bow before the image of

God our mother. When I see a harlot leaning down from her balcony I bow before her also. I say, "Behold the mother at her sport among the children of men." ' These words, spoken by a chief prophet of Hinduism at the Chicago Congress of Religions, are quoted by the Rev. E. J. BICKNELL, M.A., in *The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin* (Longmans ; 6s. net).

He does well to quote them, for they show in one fearful flash the hell towards which modern thought is moving when it turns its back on the Christian doctrine of sin. And no doctrine in our time has been more rudely assaulted or more insidiously undermined. Evolution is held to have shown that sin is but the relic of the ape and tiger, from which humanity is steadily purging itself. More recently, the new psychology claims to have disproved the Christian idea of sin. It takes a biological view of all mental life, and traces the building of all human conduct out of a small number of primitive instincts. No room is left for free will, and conscience is only an emotion. Moral distinctions merely exist in the mind of the individual or the community, and God is but a projection of the human mind.

Is it possible to turn the battle in the gate? Mr. BICKNELL's book is at least a very able attempt. He calls science itself to witness that many species have made false steps, and strayed from the upward path. ' We may apply this to the spiritual evolution of the human race. It is perfectly conceivable that the race as a whole has failed to live up to God's purpose. . . . That this is the truer statement we most firmly believe, and in support of it we appeal to the facts both of the individual life and the world at large.' So much for the doctrine of the Fall.

On the subject of original sin it is argued that some such conception is an intellectual necessity. It stands for the whole movement of the race away from God's purpose. It may be described as ' the devil's counterpart of grace. Grace is God's personal influence. And grace is always mediated directly or indirectly through the divine society, the people of God. . . . All the means of grace are social. Original sin is the antithesis of this. It acts through all the social influences that drag us down, that implant in our imaginations false ideas of God, that encourage unlawful and anti-social desires, that divert our impulses into wrong channels.'

And all leads at last to God's remedy for sin. ' In its essential nature the problem of sin remains unaffected by modern knowledge. Sin is still sin against God. It still needs redemption and forgiveness, and we believe that in Christ alone we have the remedy for the situation. We can still repeat the old text, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." '

The City and the Sanctuary.

By Professor the Reverend W. F. Lofthouse, D.D.

In the *Princeton Theological Review* of July 1922, Mr. C. M. Mackay has published a long and careful discussion of the measurements for the city and the Temple which Ezekiel has left us in his last chapter. Most readers of the prophet, who have toiled through the sections dealing with the ground plan and elevation of the visionary shrine, the materials for the sacrifices and the incomes of the hierarchy, find their interest somewhat exhausted when they reach the redistribution of the land as a whole, and the actual measurements of the spacious domains of the priesthood and the prince. But it is dangerous to regard anything in Ezekiel as uninteresting ; and Mr. Mackay's arithmetical calculations, if accepted, will lead to conclusions of great importance, both for Ezekiel and for the Judaism

of which he may rightly be called the chief begetter.

It will be best to begin by summarizing Mr. Mackay's points. (1) In 42^{16}, 45^{1}, and 48^{8}, he assumes that 'reeds,' as in both A.V. and R.V., is right, and 'cubits,' which all modern commentators prefer, wrong.

(2) He understands that the new Eastern border of the land is laid down, in 47^{18}, as stretching in a line from Damascus to the Dead Sea, instead of following the Jordan.

(3) He places the site of the Priests' portion of the 'Oblation,' containing the Temple itself, at the North of the 'Oblation,' and not, as generally supposed, at the centre.

(4) He takes the site of the new city to overlap the site of the actual Jerusalem; but he places the site of the Temple 30 miles or so to the North, at Shechem. If the first and third points are correct, the new Temple will have to be placed 30 miles North of the city. It follows that the stream which issues from the Temple does not take the course of the Kidron, but of the Wady Farah, which flows East from Shechem into the Jordan valley.

(5) Thus, the site of the great altar on Mount Moriah was to be left bare. It was indeed regarded by Ezekiel with the reverse of veneration. While the city of Zion was looked upon as the abode of the ark, the real home of the altar was at Shechem; and it is to the iniquities of the kings of Northern Israel, whose capital was at Shechem, that reference is made in 43^{7-9} ('the carcases of their kings in their high places').[1]

(6) The actual results for geography will bring us to Bethlehem as the centre of the city, 35 miles South of Mount Ebal, while the centre of the domain of the Levites (who 'went astray') will be at Bethel. The whole city is 10 miles square, and the Oblation is a square of 50 miles, a very considerable portion of the whole country. It may be noticed that 'Zion' is thus on the North (instead of on the South-West) of the city; which seems to correspond with Ps 48^{2} ('on the sides of the north').

Mr. Mackay writes with much good-humoured contempt of the 'critics' and commentators; but it is easy to see that his views are much more revolutionary than any which recent commentators on Ezekiel have thought of suggesting; they imply enormous claims for the priestly revenues; they suggest that Ezekiel was at variance with what has hitherto been understood as the general prophetic attitude to the future of Jerusalem, and that indeed he was the father, not of Judaism, but of Samaritanism. Are we forced to a conclusion so novel, and even disturbing?

Let us begin with the last three points, and take them together. Ezekiel makes it perfectly clear that he intended the Temple to be separated from the city; did he mean to separate it from its ancient site, and to transfer it, enlarged to a building covering an area over a mile square, to Mount Ebal?[2] It is quite true that in the earlier centuries of Israel's history Ephraim was the leading tribe, and Shechem was more important to the Hebrews than the Jebusite stronghold of Jerusalem. It is also true that the verdict of Hosea and even Amos on the Northern Kingdom was not the verdict of the Deuteronomic historians. Jeremiah, himself a son of the North rather than the South, has devoted one of his most striking poems to the return of the Northern tribes (Jer 30 f.). But not a word is said by them, or any other prophets, as to the substitution of the long desolated Northern sanctuary for Jerusalem as the seat of the worship of Jehovah. None of the prophetic denunciations of the wickedness of Zion threatened this last indignity. And was Shechem regarded by any of the prophets, even by the Ephraimite Hosea, as an ancient but deserted sanctuary of Jehovah? If Ezekiel, as Mr. Mackay reminds us, used language of Judah that was all but unprintable (ch. 16), his opinion of her Northern sister, save perhaps in the way of rhetoric, was no better. If, on the other hand, Ezekiel was understood to have contemplated this transference, how unintelligible would be the glowing hopes of Deutero-Isaiah, and the conduct of the Jews of the Return. Nor can we well set against this the fact that the phrase, 'the head of the mountains,' as the seat of Jehovah's house (Is 2^{2}, Mic 4^{1}) occurs also in the blessing of Joseph, or that the districts mentioned in Ps $60^{6,7}$, all occur in the 'fifty-mile square of the Terumah' or Oblation. In so wide a region, a large number

[1] Mr. Mackay claims that the Shechem site must be understood to include other towns in its neighbourhood, such as Tirzah and Samaria, where kings were actually buried, while in Jerusalem it was the good rather than the bad kings who were buried near the Temple.

[2] Mr. Mackay points out that the expression in 40^{2} does not fit the site of the Temple at Jerusalem; if so, it fits the Shechem site even less.

of the most familiar places in the country are situated. Nor can the suggested identification of Shechem with Salem (on the strength of the LXX of Gn 33^{18}), or the connexion between Zadok and Melchizedek, King of Salem (or Shechem), be considered more than very dubious. It is not too much to say that evidence much stronger than these passages would be needed to establish an interpretation of Ezekiel which would detach him so far from his predecessors and his followers. Did not every Jew hold that 'in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship'? But no Samaritan is known to have claimed the authority of Ezekiel for the place of his sanctuary.

Here, however, Mr. Mackay would remind us that there is more evidence to be found; and that, to find it, he has simply taken the text of Ezekiel as it stands. It is true that in the three passages mentioned in our first point, 'reeds' occurs and not 'cubits.' (Since a reed contains six cubits, the familiar measurements must, on Mr. Mackay's view, be multiplied by six.) But in the first of the three passages, 42^{16}, 'cubits' must be right (as the LXX suggests), since it is only by that reading that we can make the measurements tally with those given elsewhere (cf. v.^{20}, where the Hebrew omits 'reeds,' and $40^{21\text{-}37}$). In 45^{1}, 'reeds' is a mere insertion of the English translators; but 'cubits' occurs in v.^{2}, showing decisively what length the prophet had in mind. Nor does 'reeds' occur, either in the M.T. or the LXX of chap. $48^{8ff.}$. It thus appears that the only MS. support for 'reeds' is in 42^{16}, where the Massoretic 'reeds' can only land us in conflict with earlier measurements; and indeed the text is not above suspicion, nor are we justified in summarily discarding the LXX for the M.T. Mr. Mackay asks why the angel should use a reed to measure cubits (v.^{16}); but that he had done so already is certainly implied by $40^{5ff.}$.

Keeping, then, to the traditional 'cubits,' we find the dimensions less startling. The whole Oblation covers a square not of 50 miles, but of rather less than 8 miles; and the Temple area is not a square of a mile, but of some 300 yards. Further, as we shall see, the portion containing the Oblation and the Prince's domain is not, then, as it is on Mr. Mackay's reckoning, out of all proportion to the tribal territories.

The remaining points, two and three, need not detain us so long. Ezekiel's language in describing the Eastern frontier of the country (47^{18}) is so obscure that the text can hardly be right. The LXX differs considerably. Various conjectures have been made. It is clear that since the line starts on the North-East from a spot (Hazar-Hattikon) between Damascus and the Hauran, that part of the frontier at least must have been East of Jordan; but it is equally possible that the line passed rapidly to the upper reaches of the Jordan. Mr. Mackay refers to the need of drawing a line parallel to the Mediterranean coast-line if the tribal territories are to be equal; but such a line would correspond to no natural feature across Jordan; and where the Mediterranean coast turns sharply to the West near the Wady el-Arish, the parallel would have to be deserted. Mr. Mackay urges that the country East of the Jordan had always been regarded as part of Israel: but his line would cut right through the territories regarded as assigned to Reuben, Gad, and part of Manasseh.

Was the most holy part of the Oblation on the Northern side of the Oblation as a whole, or in the centre of it? Chap. 48^{8} certainly implies that the Temple was in the centre of the whole Oblation, and not comparatively near to its Northern border. And while the prophet's general order in description is from North to South, there is surely no necessity that he should follow the same order when he has reached the Oblation and is describing its special structure. The point is not a very important one for the measurements of the land, when we take 'cubits' rather than 'reeds.' But, in spite of Mr. Mackay's suggested gradation from the less to the more holy in the Oblation, *i.e.* from the city, and then the Levites' domain, to the Priests' domain and the Temple itself, it is hard to think that Ezekiel would have placed his most holy section anywhere save in the centre of the sacred estate.

We can now compare the actual arrangement of the whole land, according to Mr. Mackay, and to the older view. What were to be its boundaries? The Eastern boundary we have already discussed; the Northern would seem to have passed along a line from near Tyre, South of Hermon, and on to the region, perhaps, of the modern Hajj road. The West was the seacoast, and the Southern line started near the Wady el-Arish and passed to the region South of the Dead Sea. The whole territory, from North to South, measures about 160 miles. It is divided between the Oblation and the Twelve Tribes, each tribe possessing a strip of equal breadth, and presumably, Mr. Mackay would add, length;

seven tribes have their strips North of the Oblation, and five South. There are 65 miles between Mr. Mackay's Oblation and the Northern frontier; this will allow each tribe a strip about 9 miles broad; and 40 miles between the Oblation and the Southern frontier, allowing each of the five tribes a strip some 8 miles broad. On the older arrangement, measuring by cubits and placing the centre of the Oblation at Jerusalem, the strip of each of the Northern tribes will be 14 miles broad, and of each of the Southern tribes, 10 miles broad, the Oblation-strip being 8 miles broad. But it is doubtful whether at this point Ezekiel was thinking of topography at all. How could the tribes, if they did return, be uprooted from their old habitations? How could Judah, who had formed a 'kingdom' to itself, be content with no more than Simeon, a tribe which had long since ceased to exist at all? And how could a land so varied in contour, climate, and fertility as Palestine, be equitably divided up in this diagrammatic fashion? Clearly Ezekiel is for the time out of touch with actuality. The question to which this discussion leads is of considerable importance. What did Ezekiel envisage? How far did he keep to what had been familiar to him and his hearers? On any interpretation, he introduced surprising novelties. The rearrangement of tribes, the mathematical distribution of their territory, taking no account of the fertile regions of the centre of the land or the barren stretches to the South, and the separation between the Temple and the city, are sensational enough even if we keep to the traditional view. But at least, the sites of city and Temple would be in the old familiar country, and the structure and dimensions of the Temple are very similar to those of Solomon's Temple, which Ezekiel and his public would know by heart. Each of the alterations introduced by Ezekiel has its basis in the prophet's desire for symmetry or for purity. On the other hand, on Mr. Mackay's arrangement, apart from the immense proportion of the country taken up by the Oblation, we cannot but wonder at the audacity which would plan out a city stretching more than half-way along the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, and right down along the defiles into the Jordan valley, and which would force the Temple, outsoaring all the well-known proportions of its predecessor, to cover an area of a square mile.

The truth is that there is a curious mixture of the exact and the vague in all Ezekiel's visions, as there is indeed in his addresses. Details he sees very clearly—so clearly that he is always challenging us to draw diagrams; how they will all fit into one picture he does not trouble to ask. This is plain enough to every student of the vision of the cloud-chariot in chaps. 1 and 10. The love of symmetry and diagram, with its limitations, is equally clear in the argument in chap. 18. Further, there is always a striking contrast between the prophet's concentration on the focus of consciousness and the mistiness of the periphery. Thanks to this concentration, we know the details of the new Temple better than we know the details of Solomon's structure. But in the frontiers of the country and the holdings of the different tribes Ezekiel was plainly not interested. His language—so far as we can recover it—is hurried and ambiguous; just the sort of language to induce textual corruption.

The same combination is seen in the description of the new river ($47^{2ff.}$); it is to flow directly from the city to the East, and in less than a mile and a half it has risen to more than the height of a man; how it accomplished this, and how it proceeded through the remaining 15 miles or so of its course (whether from Shechem or Jerusalem), Ezekiel does not pause to consider.[1] Again, the salt industry around the Dead Sea is not to come to an end; but the manner of the division between the sweetened and the still salt waters is clearly 'peripheral.' We are reminded of the description of the burial of the corpses of the host of Gog (ch. 39), where, after provision has been made for all that ritual holiness could require, the picture is, so to speak, shut off.

The reader is involuntarily reminded of the contrasts in the dream-consciousness. Long before the psycho-analysts made the structure of every dream the work of a fascinating phantom army of desires and fears, most people were familiar with the way in which details will stand out against—nothing at all, and the experiences and ideas of the past day or days will appear in wholly impossible yet (as it seems at the time) entirely natural combinations. It is not to be supposed that the last nine chapters of Ezekiel are a normal (or even an

[1] Mr. Mackay urges that the language of $47^{8f.}$ would fit the Wady Farah, but not a river flowing East from Jerusalem. This is by no means certain. The phrase 'the two rivers' need not refer to the Farah and the Jordan, now united; it is rather an error, introduced from Zec 14^{8}. LXX reads 'the river.'

abnormal) dream; but they are put before us as a vision rather than an ordinary waking experience (cf. $11^{1f.}$), and in this as in other visions, Ezekiel's mind certainly seems to obey some of the laws of the dream. Doubtless, it 'hangs together' as no dream ever did; but one can see, at least in part, how the splendid and unearthly building came to be. It grew silently, like its predecessor, without sound of hammer or axe. Ezekiel knew every line, every stone, of the building on Moriah; he had pondered over every structural arrangement that made misuse of the holy place horribly possible; and in his twenty-six years of exile in Mesopotamia, his recollections of the Temple, as keen as if he had been absent only for a day, had lived on side by side with his perception of the possibilities, for purposes of order and symmetry, of a vast and well-watered plain. Though the mountains remained as dear to him as ever (see especially ch. 36), the plain had distinct advantages if the land was to be plotted out satisfactorily, with the Temple as near the centre of the land as it could well be. And in a vision, the glory of the mountains and the convenience of the plain could unite.

Mr. Mackay would not perhaps object to this vision-psychology; he holds, indeed, that under his view of the arrangement of the land, there is no impracticability; but under any view, and certainly under his view of the vast space of the city, and the mighty Temple platform on the top of Mount Ebal, nothing could be done unless it were possible to 'sink the mountain to a plain.'

Literature.

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA.

Professor W. Adams Brown has written a great book on a great subject. *The Church in America* (Macmillan; 14s. net) is a study of the present condition and future prospects of American Protestantism. During the war Professor Adams Brown was Chairman of the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, and thereafter Secretary of the General War-time Commission of the Churches. No man has had a finer opportunity of surveying the religious situation, and he has made full use of it. He has not only collected the facts but he has mastered them. Here are no masses of undigested statistics, but a living picture of the Church in America as the War found it, of its manifold war work, and of all it both hoped and failed to do when the War was over.

For the sheer joy of it let us quote the story of one man who made good. 'One of the finest pieces of work done in the War was done by a Presbyterian minister over sixty years of age, who entered one of the large industrial establishments in a Western city as a welfare worker. Through his tact and resourcefulness he so altered the morale of the workers that the output of the plant more than doubled. Yet this same man had been seeking a church in vain for years.'

The major part of the book is occupied with a survey of the vast problems that confront the Church at home and abroad, in city and country, in the fields of intellectual and social life. Professor Adams Brown has thought long and deeply on these problems, and his thinking never loses contact with the world of actual facts. It is the situation as it presents itself in America that is directly in view, but the problems that face the Church in Britain are essentially the same, and so are the principles that must govern a true solution.

America, it seems, has its problem of rural depopulation and over-churching in an aggravated form. Witness the State of Ohio with 2807 churches, 37 per cent. of which have less than fifty members, or the State of Missouri, where only 4 per cent. of the country churches have resident ministers. 'Yet in these same communities there may be two, three, or even four or five different church buildings standing side by side.' This is one of the factors which make Church Union a pressing question. Professor Adams Brown treats this subject in a most illuminating and suggestive way. It is, in fact, the thesis to which his book is devoted. He holds it to be vital 'that we re-think our doctrine of the Church.' Not that we should continue our discussion of Church unity in the abstract, but we must determine what should be the function of the Church in our democratic society and come to a

definite understanding as to how the existing churches can see this function adequately discharged.

The following sentences on the League of Nations are significant as expressing the mind of the Church in America. 'The acclamation with which the proposal of the League was received in the most widely separated circles, no less than the deep despondency and even despair with which its momentary failure has been followed, is the best witness to the fact that it touched some deeper chord than is reached by our conventional politics; that it expressed those underlying yearnings which belong not to any one nation or group of nations, but to man as man; that, in short, its appeal passed beyond politics into religion. . . . While it is true that the recent campaign against the League has led many of its former advocates to recognise weaknesses and dangers in its present form which will need to be corrected, those who are responsible for the present conduct of the nation's affairs will make a grave mistake if they interpret the present disposition of their constituency to allow them large latitude in finding the way in which that correction can be made, as indicating any loss of faith in the central purpose for which the League was created or any weakening of the will to realise it.'

THE INTEREST OF THE BIBLE.

The Interest of the Bible, by Professor J. E. McFadyen (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.), is a challenging title; for, obviously, it requires a more than usually interesting book to carry it successfully. But it is just such a book that Dr. McFadyen has given us. These eighteen fine papers afford further evidence of the width and precision of his scholarship, of the characteristic balance of his mind, and of the singular lucidity of his style. Specially attractive is a catholic-minded study of Hellenism and Hebraism, where his classical learning finds scope, and lands him on some points in very different conclusions from what were once accepted, as a comparison with certain famous passages in 'Ecce Homo,' for example, will make clear; or the moving character-sketch of Saul. When A. B. Davidson was at New College his most famous lecture was on Saul, and once a year the other professors, facing nearly empty benches, uncomplainingly accepted the explanation that their various classes were all listening to it! Only Davidson himself resented it, and has been known to substitute a dry discussion on some point of syntax, finally looking round the crowded room with a mischievous smile. Dr. McFadyen also leaves Saul one of the most pathetic figures in history—this phlegmatic brooding youth, so he conceives him, who, suddenly fired by the splendour of the conception of the Kingdom, gave for it all he had in an eager passion of religious enthusiasm that burned up his life, and, even when believing himself outcast from God, one who had sinned the unpardonable sin, still laboured on with a fine desperate zeal for his ideal. There are five detailed studies of communion with God, what that meant for the prophets, in the Historical Books, and in the Psalms, for Jesus Christ, and in the New Testament church; or, to name only one more, 'the preacher,' says Dr. McFadyen, 'tends to develop the homiletic mind at the expense of his historical conscience,' like the Chronicler who arrives at 'a much simpler and smoother conception of the divine government of the world than is yielded by the stubborn facts themselves,' and therewith he launches out on a fascinating study of History and Homiletics. This is, perhaps, the best book Dr. McFadyen has yet given us.

KANT.

A new book by James Ward is always welcome. Among those who have striven in recent times to make works on Philosophy not only intelligible but interesting, he takes a high place. We rejoice that he has brought to bear upon Kant the instruments of his clear thought and clear literary style. For it is well worth while to understand Kant; and Kant's thought, as he himself expressed it, is most elusive owing to the execrable literary form in which he clothed it. For a true understanding of Kant, however, more is needful than a clear exposition of his great treatises. Kant was a voluminous writer, and he wrote on a bewildering variety of topics. His minor works are very little known in this country. In Germany in recent years there has been a great amount of patient study of all that Kant published, and that study was worth undertaking, for it casts much light on the Kantian philosophy. Our author knows the results of all that intensive investigation and discussion, and in the light of them he is able to present us with such a clear-sighted view

of Kant's thought and of the vacillations it underwent as makes us wish that it had been treated in the fuller measure to which Ward confesses he at one time looked forward. Such as it is, however, the book is one for which all students of Kant will be grateful. The title is *A Study of Kant* (Cambridge: at the Univ. Press; 12s. 6d. net).

BISHOP MOULE.

The late Bishop Moule was a scholar, a saint, and (in the true sense) a Christian gentleman. This is the impression left on the mind of a reader by the substantial biography which has been written by Canon Hartford and Canon Macdonald: *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net). This was the estimate of the Bishop which was commonly held by the Christian public before the *Life* appeared, so widely known and so highly esteemed was its subject in all the churches. What the writers have done, and done admirably, is to confirm and illuminate by many interesting details the general opinion, and also to reveal clearly the influences which helped to shape so notable a personality.

One of these influences was the future Bishop's home life, of which a beautiful picture is given in the book. It was a home of piety and learning, where the children learned not only to love God, but to love good literature and to value sound scholarship. One of the finest things the writers have to tell is the fact that twice over, when young Moule was on the top of a wave of success and influence at Cambridge, he threw everything over to go home and bury himself for years in his father's parish in order to relieve somewhat his father's burden of labour. We can trace to these early years the habit of accurate scholarship which was to bear such fine fruit in his published works.

The other formative influence in his life was his own definite religious experience. Dr. Moule was for long the recognized leader of the Evangelicals in England. It might be said of him, what was said of another prominent man in connexion with Temperance, that he made evangelical opinion respectable. His theology was rooted in an experience which was so sincere and so deep that it never ceased to show itself in his life. This is what won for him so much respect, and even reverence, from those who differed widely from him in conviction. It produced in him a strong sense of duty and a patient tolerance of those who opposed him, which are repeatedly illustrated by his biographers. One of the best of these instances is given in connexion with his difficult relations with one of his clergy at Durham. They had acute controversies which frequently threatened to end in an open breach. After the worst of these the clergyman received a short letter from the Bishop, offering him an important living and in the kindest words of appreciation. 'Well,' he said to his wife, 'he is a man after all, a man that can bear no grudge.' For years afterwards the Bishop had no more devoted friend and supporter in the diocese.

Dr. Moule was, perhaps, not a great man or a great Bishop, but his writings have nourished and sustained a religious experience in multitudes both inside and outside his own communion; his work as Principal of Ridley Hall drew many young men into the ministry of the Church, and can be traced to-day in many influential lives; and his personal character has been an inspiration to men of different schools. The life of such a man was well worth writing, and in this volume the work has been well and truly done.

WHICH ARE THE TWELVE GREATEST CHRISTIAN CLASSICS?

Lamb, that huge reader, admits in one of his letters, 'I take less pleasure in books than heretofore, but I like books about books.' Professor R. E. Welsh has issued a notable volume belonging to that order. *Classics of the Soul's Quest* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net) is a fine title; and these studies of some twelve or so of the spiritual masterpieces are worthy of it. In each case there is, with bibliographies attached, a sufficient account of the author's life and times, a careful and scholarly synopsis of the book or books under review, and some indication of the part they have played in the world's history, all prefaced by an informing introduction, and ending in a discussion on the distinctiveness of Christian experience. Dr. Welsh's wide reading and alert and interesting mind are well known; and he has put both of them into his work. It would hardly be possible to be dull with such a theme; but here, at all events, the reader is swept along in admiration of the author's deftness. Moreover, since one cannot deal with the whole of an inexhaustible field, but must pick and choose, the selection made gives an added interest

by its inevitable revelation of the man who so selects. Were you to name the twelve greatest Christian spiritual classics, what would your list be? Dr. Welsh votes for Augustine, Dante, Tauler, *Theologia Germanica*, à Kempis, Bunyan, Law, Behmen, Wesley, Tolstoy, Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, and Rabindranath Tagore. Evidently, therefore, while reasonably orthodox, he is up to date. He has no great liking for the French mind, relegates Pascal and, more reasonably, Amiel to a couple of pages in the appendix; while the other masters, Fénelon, St. Francis of Sales, and the rest are overlooked. No women are included, except hurriedly in the few pages of small print. He does not care for Letters; and, as is right, he has his favourites. Dante gets seventy pages, the *Theologia Germanica* five; to Tagore or *Marius* is allotted as much space as to Bunyan or à Kempis, and almost as much as to Law, Wesley, and Behmen squeezed together. Upon the whole he seems to prefer those whose mysticism is not too intrusive.

It is a goodly fellowship, a great and honouring possession. And Dr. Welsh makes clear that it in no way exhausts Jesus Christ, that coming ages will produce classics as deep and splendid, which will be no mere echoes of our own, but real originals, breaking fresh ground, and viewing our Lord in new aspects. At present he admits a dearth of works of the first rank. But he is wisely sure that, when the East is won for Christ, they will appear there; and in the West he feels that Tolstoy is the forerunner of a new type of spiritual classic, less self-absorbed, and personal and individualistic, that will give utterance to that sense of brotherhood, that call to service, that more acute social conscience, which, he feels, are what give Christianity a main appeal to modern men and women.

THE CHRISTIAN HYPOTHESIS.

'It is common for less thoughtful teachers of religion to set faith and reason in contrast or even in opposition, and at the lowest level of such teaching faith is exalted and reason is all but denounced.' The quotation is from *The Christian Hypothesis*, by Edward Campbell Tainsh (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). We can all bear witness to its truth. We have heard proud reason denounced as the enemy of simple faith, and this has been a stumbling to many, an occasion of perplexity or of stout-hearted rebellion. It is the aim of the writer to contribute towards a permanent settlement of this recurring dispute, by showing that 'faith is an activity of man within his reason, not a gift received in passivity, not a non-reasoned conviction projected by God into the consciousness.' The whole book is a fine piece of closely-knit argument, and every sentence is packed with thought.

Here is one of the all-too-rare illustrations: 'Climbing a mountain is an activity of man in his muscles. There are many activities of man in his muscles which are not climbing a mountain. If it were pitch dark, a man could not well climb a mountain, nor could he if he were drunk or very ill or in a state of starvation. Notwithstanding all these, climbing a mountain is an activity of man in his muscles. There are many activities of man in his reason which are not faith, and there are many hindrances to faith in the man himself. None the less, faith may be an activity of a man within his reason.' The climber, to follow the illustration, is not left to toil upward in pitch darkness. 'God hath shined.' But is the climber himself spiritually fit? He may be drunk with prejudice, fevered with pride, starving in selfishness, or disabled in some way for his high enterprise. In particular, he may lack the honest and good heart which is an essential condition of the discernment of spiritual truth. But if he have that, he is required to take no wild leap in the dark, but may travel to faith by the road of reason.

What is the practical bearing of all this? It is that faith is a duty and an act of man—a duty and an act possible only through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, but performed through the honest exercise of right reason. 'It would therefore seem that, not by the reviling of human reason but by summoning it into the regions of holiness and worship, religion can best be helped.'

REMINISCENCES OF A ROTHSCHILD.

'I have always been of opinion that there cannot be too many Rothschilds'—so Lord Beaconsfield once wrote to a member of the famous family of bankers. So long as they number among them gentlewomen of the high character of Lady Battersea, the elder daughter of Sir Anthony Rothschild, who has just published her *Reminiscences* (Macmillan; 21s. net), we wholly agree with him.

She has a notable ancestry on both her father's and her mother's side, for the latter was a Monte-

fiore. She has lived a very full life, not only in London society as a great entertainer, but as one very actively engaged in work among the Jewish population of the East End, and also in temperance and other philanthropic work, to which she has given largely both of her time and of her ample means.

Lady Battersea writes of her father that 'The Rothschilds were in his eyes people apart from all others.' 'His Jewish proclivities brought him into touch with the philanthropic and educational work of his race, who at that time were just beginning to emerge from their life of separation. In my childhood the Jews were still suffering from civil and religious disabilities; they had no very assured social standing and there was in many quarters a deep-seated prejudice against them. My family, while remaining true to their religion, established a firm footing in the social and political life of their country.' It is obviously from her mother that Lady Battersea derives her inspiration to follow after good works. She writes: 'Hers was a fine spiritual nature, rising above all sectarianism, even above racial bias, and claiming affinity with the noblest minds of every creed.' She read with pleasure the sermons of Martineau, Parker, and Robertson, feeling some kinship with the Unitarians, but she was also much attracted by the Society of Friends.

Lady Battersea and her sister were brought up according to Mid-Victorian ideas, but she feels that 'increased independence has brought into many lives a wider sphere of influence for mind and character, and therefore a surer prospect of well-earned happiness.' She and her sister married Englishmen outside the pale of Jewry. Her husband, Mr. Cyril Flower, was appointed, by Mr. Gladstone, Junior Liberal Whip. He was one of the two best-looking men in the House of Commons of his time, popular with all parties. For his efficient services Mr. Gladstone gave him a peerage, greatly to his wife's disappointment, as her ambitions for her husband were very different.

Lady Battersea inherited, with her share of the Rothschild millions, their disposition for entertaining. It is a wonderful gallery of notables to which she introduces us in these Reminiscences, ranging from King Edward, Queen Alexandra, and the Princess Louise, as intimate friends, to a succession of Prime Ministers of both political parties, and eminent men and women of letters. She is charmed with 'Dizzy' and even with 'Mary Anne,' for 'if foolish, and at times even ridiculous, she was a splendid wife.' She reverences Mr. Gladstone and Mrs. Gladstone, 'that wonderful couple'; and no sign of party prejudice is apparent in her pen-portraits of such diverse personalities as Mr. Balfour, who will only read novels that end happily; Lord Rosebery, the husband of her cousin, Hannah de Rothschild, 'one of the most devoted and unselfish wives that ever lived'; 'C.B.' with his devotion to his ailing wife, and his liking for French novels and knowledge of French literature; and Mr. Asquith and his first wife, 'a true home-maker and home-keeper and an excellent mother.' She finds it a difficult task to give a portrait of the present Mrs. Asquith, 'a most original, dazzling, and astonishing' personality.

The most remarkable characteristic of all that we are told of the cosmopolitan crowd that passes through the four hundred and fifty pages of this book is that there is almost nothing but what is of good report. The writer is not uncritical, but she has the gift of charity. She delights to see her guests at their best, and so to depict them. Lady Battersea was undoubtedly a hostess of great charm. That charm she has also given to these Reminiscences of a crowded, an interesting, and a useful life.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF GEORGE FOX.

Every rightly constituted mind is immediately prejudiced in favour of a book issued with an introductory note in which, amid much praise, it is frankly admitted that the 'thesis contains some crudities and extravagances,' and 'obvious instances' of 'needlessly elaborate psychological or even physiological interpretation of expressions used by Fox, which bear a simpler explanation.' For one thing, such honesty creates a strong presumption that the praise is likely to be trustworthy. And so in this case it is. There are things in *The Founder of Quakerism*, by Rachel Knight, Ph.D. (Swarthmore Press; 12s. 6d. net), that are somewhat irritating; diagrams, which to some minds are quite unhelpful and somewhat uncouth, and repetitions here and there that give the impression that the book must have been originally a series of separate studies that have been welded into a whole, not quite perfectly.

But the study of Fox, that queer amalgam of conflicting qualities, is thorough and patient and elaborately careful. Here is no mere blind hero-worship, but an honest and discriminating bit of first-hand investigation, which brings vividly before one the bigness and wonder of the man, and yet somehow, probably quite unconsciously, leaves an impression of him not altogether pleasant.

The attempted analysis of his particular type of mysticism is a bold endeavour in a field in which not very much has yet been done, and is, perhaps, not so successful. One has the feeling that things are being overstrained; that the author, as the golfers say, is pressing. Thus, in a chapter on the Hypersensitivity of Fox's senses, remarkable instances of this are heaped together in the most haphazard way with things that mean nothing at all, such as 'the mosquitoes on the Rhode Island shore were very troublesome to him.' Often there are elaborate explanations of perfectly simple facts, and sometimes the book is written quite unnecessarily in a quasi-scientific jargon that is not English. The author has an eager interest in our ever-increasing knowledge of the extent to which character can be traced back to bodily functions and peculiarities. But sometimes this is overdone. Fox's eyes, like the Master's, greatly impressed people. Dr. Knight gives various instances of folk crying out to him to turn them away, as they felt pierced by them; and she remarks, 'His eyes often glowed with the inner stimulation that comes from a virile blood supply and perhaps also from active glandular secretions.' Fox had 'a sight and sense of the King's return' before it happened. 'Here, it seems to me, the kinæsthetic motor process caused the cortical excitation of the visual centre calling forth such a visual image with its accompanying kinæsthetic feeling which he interprets as a sense of prophetic revelation.' So now we understand it. This kind of thing, when carried into the inner recesses of spiritual sanctities, is not successful. You see, men say, tearing some delicate bloom to pieces, this is the calyx, this the corona, these the stamens, and so on, and, yes, that's all. But that withering little heap is not the flower; the something that made it has escaped them. And when Fox has been duly dissected in this vivisectional fashion, the wonder of him still escapes, is not to be pinned down, like a dead butterfly.

THE CRITICS CRITICISED.

One suspects that Dr. Fitchett hugely enjoyed writing *Where the Higher Criticism Fails* (Epworth Press; 4s.), which sweeps along with not a little of the rush of 'Deeds that Won the Empire.' Although no opponent of Higher Criticism in itself, he holds a very orthodox position; and, feeling that there are many treacherous bogs about, advances cautiously, tapping every foot of ground before he will commit himself to it, sometimes rather comically, where to most eyes it looks sound enough. For what worries him is the utter recklessness with which theories are too often spun by the dozen out of airy nothings, and flung down dogmatically without any kind of proof except simple assertion, or the exercise of unchastened imagination. Where criticism fails, he feels, is partly through its curious lack of humour; and he makes great play, on the one hand, with the weird fantasies of a Preserved Smith or a Venturini, and, on the other, with the extreme caution of Canon Barnes' references to our Lord, which strike him as a rather cramped and unimpressive testimonial, the kind of thing that one might offer on behalf of an ordinary student of average intelligence and gifts. His own humour, always hearty, sometimes really clever, is on occasion almost boisterous. Even upon the road to Emmaus he cracks a jest, in itself an admirable one; only there one would prefer to walk in reverent silence. And on the whole one has the feeling that the world is a more puzzling place, and some things more manysided, than Dr. Fitchett seems to think.

There are three roads to peace recommended to those who are grievously troubled. There is the path of Christian Science, which counsels them to ignore and deny the reality of the ills from the illusion of which they suffer. There is the way of trying to be strong, and in our own strength overcoming. Then there is the solution of Faith in Christ. To show the futility of the first two and the success of the third is the purpose of Mrs. Horace Porter, who writes *The Christian Science of Thought* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Thomas E. Miller of Dunfermline has written, and Messrs. Allenson have published, a

third volume of Bible Portraits. We have already had *Portraits of Women of the Bible* and *Portraits of Women of the New Testament*, and we now have *Portraits of Men of the Old Testament* (6s. net). This volume contains lectures on twelve Old Testament heroes, ranging from Othniel to Samuel. Mr. Miller accepts the 'narratives as they have come down to us,' retells the stories, and draws some sound lessons.

The University Press at Cambridge has sent out a full and scholarly study of *The Sixty-eighth Psalm* (8s. 6d. net), comprising an introduction, a revised translation and critical notes, by W. W. Cannon. It is a fine piece of work, in every way worthy of Cambridge learning. The introduction, extending to forty-one large pages, discusses the different interpretations of the psalm and the dates to which it has been assigned, deciding for the period of the restoration from exile. The psalm is an expression of the joy and hope that possessed the people, who were once more in possession of their own city. The translation is not only accurate but dignified and impressive, and the book is beautifully printed.

A pleasing missionary book for children has been published by the C.M.S. with the title *The Magic Dog*. The writer is G. C. Beach, and he certainly has the gift. The different nations of the world are described in their manners and customs, and the whole thing is so skilfully strung upon a thread of story, and so charmingly illustrated by little sketches in the text, that the average child will not realize that he is imbibing knowledge and missionary interest at the same time. The book is prettily got up and would make a pleasing gift for young people.

James Urquhart, F.S.A.(Scot.), is the recognized exponent of the teaching of William Honyman Gillespie. Gillespie's *a priori* argument for the Being and attributes of God can never be popularized, but it has profoundly influenced certain types of mind. Dr. John Clifford has confessed, 'In my college days I was specially helped by Mr. Gillespie's great work. A wave of scepticism had swept over my mind and carried away my faith in God. Gillespie's argument recovered it, and steadied my intellectual movements for years.' Mr. Urquhart has now edited *The Parerga of William Honyman Gillespie* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net). The book is a labour of love, and it is well to have preserved these minor works of one whose name will ever occupy a respectable place on the roll of Scottish philosophers.

Life's Transient Dream is a volume containing fourteen brief practical discourses by David Russell Kyd, who was for fifty-eight years minister of Foulis Wester in Perthshire (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). There is a short introduction by Dr. Wallace Williamson.

The Diocesan Press (formerly the S.P.C.K.) in Madras has never published a better biography—small though it is—than *Ragland Pioneer*, by Amy Wilson Carmichael. The authoress does not trouble to chronicle external happenings. She gets at the very heart of the man, and we feel with her that 'it might all have happened yesterday; for times change and customs; phrases pass, our very speech takes to itself new dress, the old sounds outworn to us, but the great elemental things of life do not change at all; like earth, air, water, fire, they abide unaltered and unalterable.' The little Life is living from cover to cover.

One of the best missionary books issued during the season is *Missionary Heroes of Africa*, by the Rev. J. H. Morrison (Doran; $1.50). Mr. Morrison has other well-known missionary books to his credit, but none of them will be more popular than this one, in which the writer tells, with graphic pen, the life-story of missionaries like Moffat, Livingstone, Laws, Mackay, Grenfell, Coillard, Mary Slessor. The book is written for the young, and we cannot imagine a better book for the purpose of interesting them in missions. The lives of these great men and women are a fascinating record as mere biography, and this fascination loses nothing at the hands of Mr. Morrison.

Dr. Frederick F. Shannon, who has succeeded Dr. Dwight Hillis and Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus as minister of the Central Church, Chicago, has collected some of the sermons preached by him on special occasions, giving the volume the title *Sermons for Days We Observe*. Though we do not observe all the days here—for Dr. Shannon has a sermon for Lincoln's birthday, Washington's birthday, Grant's

birthday, and Mother's Day (it seems a pity we do not observe the last)—something of value may be got from each address. Take this story from the one on Lincoln. 'A Springfield neighbour was drawn to his door one day by the crying of children. He saw Mr. Lincoln passing by with two of his sons, both yelling lustily. "Why, what is the matter with the boys?" he inquired. "Just what is the matter with the whole world," answered Lincoln. "I've got three walnuts, and each wants two."' The book is attractively got up in blue with red lettering, by the George H. Doran Company ($1.50).

One of the most hopeful activities of our time is the effort to popularize theology. This is as it should be, for the Bible is every man's library, and its message is addressed not to the expert but to the man in the street. In *The Essentials of Christianity* (Doran; $2), Professor Henry C. Sheldon, D.D., supplies a simple and non-technical treatment of the great doctrines of the Christian faith. His theses are: '(1) Man, as being constitutionally a religious being, must in the long run have a religion. (2) Christianity is distinctly superior to any other historic religion. (3) The essential truths and spirit of Christianity are so high and perfect that there is no real occasion to harbour the thought of their being improved upon.' Throughout the book there are manifest a sound judgment, a ripe and mellow wisdom which are fitted to conciliate and persuade the reader. Topics like the inspiration of Scripture are finely handled with the avoidance of all unnecessary controversy. The space given to the refutation of Premillenarian views may be taken as indicating that these have attained to more prominence in America than in Britain.

Dr. Clovis C. Chappell of Washington is one of America's popular preachers. He has issued a volume of *Sermons on Biblical Characters* (Doran; $1.50). The sermons have a distinctly modern flavour and are full of sound teaching crisply expressed. They make no attempt to scale the heights or penetrate the depths, but they maintain a good level throughout. The treatment is often suggestive and the illustrations are apt and memorable, if occasionally melodramatic.

Mr. Bardsley Brash has written a small book called *The Pilgrim's Way* (Epworth Press; 2s. net), because he believes that what we need to-day is the 'temper and mind of the pilgrim.' The book is Mr. Brash's account of the problems and pleasures, hindrances and helps, ideals and dreams of the pilgrim, and is an answer to the questions, 'Who am I?' and 'Why am I here?' 'Alice, amidst all the perplexing changes of Wonderland, cried out, "Who am I? Ah; that's the puzzle." It is indeed. For if we could answer that question, and also another—"Why am I here?"—we should know the meaning of life. We ask many questions, for—to use the phrase of the Elephant's child, of whom Kipling writes—we have "a 'satiable curtiosity"; and yet how rarely we ask the two which are most central!' The book is full of similar happy allusions.

If any one is setting out on a course of sermons on the Old Testament characters or the like, he had better have a look at *Ancient Hebrew Stories and their Modern Interpretation* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.), by Professor Jordan of Kingston. For there he will find an admirably clear and lucid introduction of some seventy pages, giving in compact form the main results of the patient researches of modern scholarship, and thereafter a careful study of each story, the sources, the parallels, the ideas of permanent value embodied in it, and so on. But he will have to read with caution, for he will see the heads of sermons staring out at him from every page; will come on them almost too easily.

If I Miss the Sunrise, by J. H. Chambers Macaulay, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), is offered as 'a study in the reality of religion.' It is on the whole a somewhat perplexing and unsatisfactory book. The writer sets out to trace the process by which he passed from the materialism of last generation to a full faith in the God of love as revealed in Jesus Christ. There is evidence of wide reading, of competent scholarship, of unusual wealth and even exuberance of language. But the reader moves forward through a mist of words amid which he looks in vain for the sunrise of clear thinking. Better work is done when the writer comes to the exposition of the life and passion and resurrection of Jesus as the revelation of the God of love. Here the warmth of his Christian feeling finds scope, and inspires his apologetic with the glow of a fine

passion. The pages are brightened with a pleasing variety of literary allusions, and the book, if not a serious contribution to Christian thinking, is fitted to be a stimulus to Christian devotion.

Since the days when Tatian compiled his 'Diatessaron' the problem of harmonizing the four Gospels has had a fascination for many minds. Modern criticism has put the older harmonies out of date by showing that the Gospels do not supply the necessary chronological data. Still, for purposes of study and comparison, a harmony is useful and even necessary. To meet this need we have modern harmonies, in Greek or English, of the Synoptic or of all four Gospels. Of harmonies in English undoubtedly the freshest and the best is *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ*, by Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). It is a revision of the well-known harmony by Dr. Broadus, who was the first to abandon the attempt to establish a hard-and-fast chronology, and to concern himself rather with bringing out 'the inner movements of the history, towards that long-delayed but foreseen and inevitable collision, in which, beyond all other instances, the wrath of man was made to praise God.'

In Professor Robertson's competent hands the harmony becomes a new work. Here there are no forced renderings, no special pleading. The data are given as free from bias as circumstances allow, so that students can use the book and interpret the facts according to their various theories. No effort is made to reconcile all the divergent statements of various details in the different Gospels. The differences challenge the student's interest as much as the correspondences, and are natural marks of individual work. In the appendix valuable notes are given on points of special difficulty. The tone of these discussions is impartial and eminently fair. The book should prove helpful to the student of the English New Testament.

In *The New Psychology and the Parent* (Jarrolds; 6s. net), Dr. H. Crichton Miller attempts to explain to the average parent the bearing of the discoveries of psycho-analysts on the rearing of children. That the book will have any great influence for good we do not venture to predict. Among many observations that are shrewd, suggestive, and sensible, there are some that strike us, and we think they will strike the normal parent of normal children, as rather grotesque. The author's views, it seems to us, are distorted by his extensive experience of abnormalities.

Christmas and the Year Round, by Frank Crane, D.D. (John Lane; 6s. net), contains something over a hundred very short essays full of whimsical wit and good sense. Dr. Crane rattles on in breezy style from topic to topic, his aim being, as he says, not to build a house but to supply bricks. It is not a book to be read through, but to be dipped into for refreshment in an idle hour. Yet there is much food for thought in it, for beneath the light touch there is a serious purpose.

The Holy City: A Tragedy and Allegory in Three Acts, by Dorothy St. Cyres (Longmans; 5s. net), is a noble drama in blank verse, dealing with the ancient theme of the conflict between conscience and expediency. The heroine is a girl who is torn between the claims of home and the call of a new prophet in whom she passionately believes. It is only at the very end that 'the Master' sees as he dies the City of his faith. All his disciples have left him except the faithful Mahrah. The spirit of the poem is elevated throughout and the verse dignified and beautiful.

Baron Max von Oppell finds the search for truth the chief good in life. He would say that if truth were a bird, and he had it in his hand, he would let it go for the pleasure of pursuing it. 'Once life itself provided for, the riddle is beyond doubt the most real and earnest thing before us.' And even if we shall never solve the riddle, why should we not think of it for its charm? Thus, throughout his little book, which reflects a mystical pantheism, the writer meditates, finding in beauty, time, life, and all else an expression of a dimly perceived spirit. The book is entitled *The Charm of the Riddle* (Maclehose; 3s. 6d. net).

Generally speaking, people do not regard the Sunday School as a school in the strict sense of the word, and the churches have not advanced as a body along the lines of educational reform. This, at any rate, is the opinion of the Rev. E. F. Brayley, M.A., LL.M., Vice-Principal of Culham Training College for Schoolmasters, Oxford. 'It is stated,' he says in his introduction to *A Sunday*

School in Utopia (Macmillan; 5s. net), 'that the Church lost half a million children during the war. If religious bodies do not regard Sunday-school work as important enough to be economically organized, scientifically and systematically psychologized, and paid for, we must not be surprised if the children refuse to take us seriously.'

He, at least, approaches the Sunday School with a due sense of its importance, and in the volume referred to he has set forth in lucid style the results of a rich experience. This is a book which should be in the hands of all 'ministers of religion,' clerical and lay. For there is nothing suggested that may not be achieved. The book is practical despite its visionary title. It gives a clear outline of modern child study; it offers helpful suggestions in the art of teaching; it embodies the results of recent psychological findings; it is full of useful hints for all who are engaged in the great work of religious education; and the gift of humour enables Mr. Brayley to soften many a shrewd blow which he aims at antiquated methods. Take the following extract from the chapter on 'The Superintendent and his Work': 'He must have a very high ideal of the Sunday School. He must resolve that the Sunday School shall be the best school, because it is God's school—best in method and apparatus. Very often he should begin with a bonfire—to burn up all the old hymn-books and the harmonium that won't play, that have been bequeathed to the Sunday School by the Church people. Therefore, he will give the clergy and churchwardens no rest. Backed up by teachers, he will be a thorn in their side until they make the Sunday School a real School.' Books like this are needed.

The second annual volume of Snowden's *Sunday School Lessons*, 1923 ('International Uniform' series) (Macmillan; $1.25), will appeal to those teachers who prefer the Uniform to the Graded Course. The first quarter is devoted to studies in St. Luke's Gospel; the second quarter to great men and women of the Old Testament; the third to great men and women of the New Testament; and the fourth quarter to the Missionary message of the Bible. Each lesson is carefully planned out, the whole Bible passage being quoted. Correlated material is abundantly provided by Scriptural references. In the lesson development the outstanding ethical teaching is printed in heavy black type and suggestions for questions are given at the close of each subject. The style is expository.

Any one who wishes to see what can be said for the literal theory of verbal inspiration in face of some of its greatest difficulties will find *The Creation, Fall, and Deluge*, by Rev. A. H. Finn (Marshall; 5s. net), of interest. It is pathetic to find such an argument presented to the world to-day, an argument that contends for the strict scientific and historical trustworthiness of the early chapters of Genesis. It is even more pathetic to reflect that there must be many for whom the Divine authority of Holy Scripture rests on such an argument.

For Soul and Body, by Harriette S. Bainbridge (Marshall; 1s. 6d. net), is a series of talks on Spiritual Healing, very earnest and full of good counsel. The two notes always are believe, and believe with a faith that is full surrender. Then the Lord's own vigour will flow into your body. The author has had a remarkable experience of spiritual healing herself, and speaks throughout with complete confidence.

Some addresses given by the Rev. A. Douglas Brown at the Keswick Convention have been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott with the name *Revival Addresses* (2s. 6d. net). They are earnest appeals to members of the Convention to yield themselves afresh to God, so that there may be a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit throughout the land. Mr. Brown tells of a crisis in his own life when, after twenty-five years' ministry, the Spirit of God made it clear to him that it was his duty to leave his comfortable church, and give himself to evangelistic work.

Just three years ago at Crans near Geneva—her childhood's home—Renée de Benoit died at the early age of twenty-seven. Though so young her life had been full of useful work. On the declaration of war she went as an army nurse to Lyons and remained there until her marriage, when she and her husband, Dr. Pierre de Benoit, gave themselves to mission work in India. After her death a number of her letters were collected. They breathe that spirit of longing for personal sanctification which she placed above outward activity in God's service. The letters, along with a short memoir, have now been translated into English and

have been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott (3s. 6d. net). All profits from the sale will go to the Kanarese Evangelical Mission. The title given to the volume is *A Child of the Morning*.

In *My Moorland Patients* (Murray; 12s. net) we have an illuminating and most interesting human document written by a country doctor. It was intended by the writer to be published anonymously, but since his death, just a year ago, his friends have issued it with the author's name, the late R. W. S. Bishop. After a varied training as a medical student at Leeds, London, and Paris, he found that the 'call of the wild' in his native Yorkshire was irresistible and he took up practice in Kirkby Malzeard. When one reads this remarkably vivid narrative of fact it is with a feeling that it deals with the period of the Brontë novels. But Dr. Bishop writes of what happened so recently as just before the outbreak of the Great War. Emily Brontë herself had not a more intense love for the wild stretch of country behind Haworth village than Dr. Bishop had for the same moorland, whether in the beauty of dawn, or in the dense fog and snowdrifts of winter. And he says of the inhabitants: 'These folk, though having constantly before their eyes scenes of great beauty, are yet curiously indifferent to or unconscious of it all.' There is not a chapter in this book that does not represent most vividly the characteristics of these isolated dwellers on the moorlands, the humour, the pathos, the tragedy of their lives.

Dr. Bishop says that his moorland friends were 'very obstinate, very quarrelsome, and very irreconcilable in their quarrels.' 'They never forgave and they never forgot.' The inhabitants of one village were, however, a marked contrast to their neighbours. He found that the explanation was that a former squire had been a very saintly man, with great force of character and high ideals. He took the deepest personal interest in the moral and spiritual welfare of all the village children from their earliest years. He taught them in the Sunday School, and remembered all their birthdays. 'Those he taught so well and lovingly were now parents and grandparents, and the lapse of years and experience of life had added to their gentleness and sweet reasonableness.'

Dr. Bishop has a native's command of the Yorkshire dialect, and uses it with admirable effect.

To the Hebrews, by Lesser (Pickering & Inglis; 4s. 6d.), is a good old-fashioned exposition of the Epistle. To the writer questions of criticism do not exist. The element of humanism, which has made the Bible a new book to many, is of no account. The book contains a verse by verse commentary written in a devout and earnest spirit.

The Dramatic Instinct in Religious Education, by Thomas W. Galloway, Ph.D. (The Pilgrim Press; $1.75), is an application to Bible teaching of the educational method of expression work. The writer believes that 'children have a natural inclination to play and act, that this inclination is good and not bad, that this impulse may be used to get the child to study the biblical stories with more purpose and emotional openness and enthusiasm than can be had in any other way.' Five specimens of Biblical dramas are given. Teachers of the young will welcome anything that will increase the interest of the children in Bible stories, and without doubt the dramatic instinct may be made a powerful instrument in religious education if it be used with wisdom and reverence. But there are obvious dangers. The mediæval mystery plays will ever remain a fearful example of the depths to which this sort of thing may fall.

Two uniform volumes of Miss Royden's addresses have been published this month by Messrs. Putnams. They are *Political Christianity* (noticed in 'Entre Nous') and *Prayer as a Force* (3s. 6d. net). Both volumes are sure of a public, for the freshness of Miss Royden's thought and the directness of her preaching are known.

An admirable little manual on *Christian Faith and Practice*, by the Rev. H. U. W. Stanton, Ph.D., is published by the R.T.S. (1s. net). It is an outline of the main features of the faith and life common to Christians, prepared chiefly for non-Christians. Dr. Stanton's long experience as a missionary, and his work for vernacular literature, have helped him in a task which was waiting to be done. It has been done well, and this little book will be useful to many at home as well as in the mission field.

The addresses which were delivered at the Westminster Convention, held in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in July 1922, have found a permanent

form in a volume called *The Christian Call and Motive* (S.P.C.K.; 5s.). The object of the Convention was to prepare communicants for the November Westminster Mission. Eighteen addresses were delivered by the Bishops of London and Edinburgh, the Dean of St. Paul's, Father Waggett, and Mr. E. S. Woods—among others. It is good to notice that fourteen of the addresses were upon God and His character—waiting upon God, and four on the active side of service. The purpose of the Convention was for the deepening of the spiritual life, and the addresses make a strong appeal for consecrated lives.

The latest issue of 'Texts for Students' is *Selections from the Qur'an*, made and introduced by the Rev. H. U. W. Stanton, Ph.D., and published by the S.P.C.K. (1s. net). The extracts are well chosen, and arranged with excellent titles, and Dr. Stanton's introduction is admirably brief and clear. The Qur'an is probably one of the dullest books in the world, but there are great passages in it, and it has an interest of its own as the Moslem Bible. Both the interest and the greatness are enhanced by Dr. Stanton's editing.

It is not easy to make really good children's sermons. Still less easy is it to preach effectively to boys approaching the age of adolescence. The late headmaster of Ardvreck School, Crieff, Mr. W. E. Frost, possessed that gift in a superlative degree. A second series of his addresses is published under the title of *Fight the Good Fight* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). To begin with, these addresses are based on texts and are full of sound scriptural teaching. There is nothing in them of the fanciful and trivial, which blights so many sermons to the young. The illustrations are drawn mainly from the field of history, particularly of the war, and they not merely illuminate the subject but often thrill the reader. They are just those stories of deathless heroism which no boy can listen to without feeling the lump rise in his throat and the quick throbbing of his heart which tells him of the glory of a noble life. To Boys' Brigade officers, Scoutmasters, and all who have in hand that most difficult of all work, the moral and religious training of boys, this book should prove a veritable gold mine.

The publications of the S.C.M. maintain their freshness. *China To-day through Chinese Eyes* (2s. 6d. net) contains seven papers written by four eminent Chinese scholars. They deal with such subjects as China's Renaissance, the Literary Revolution in China, the Impression of Christianity made upon the Chinese people, and the Chinese Church. The papers are all of high quality and most informing. They give a real insight into that mysterious entity, the Chinese mind, and to all interested in the Christianizing of China they provide much food for thought.

Three books for Sunday-school teachers have been issued by the 'Teachers and Taught' Publishing House, London. They are *The Concise Guide* for (respectively) the Primary, Junior, and Intermediate series of lessons prepared by the British Lessons Council. The Editor of the *Guide* in each case is Ernest H. Hayes, who himself writes the notes for the Junior and Intermediate courses. These helps are extraordinarily good. They contain everything (including guidance as to methods of teaching) that a teacher could require, and they are richly illustrated. Whatever scheme a teacher has to use he will receive much assistance from these books in the art of giving a Bible lesson. The prices of the two Junior courses is 9d., and of the Senior 3s. 6d. net.

A contribution to the question of Church union is made in a beautifully printed book that comes from the University of Chicago Press. It is called *The Community Church*, and the writer is Albert Clay Zumbrunnen ($1.50). The idea is that one Church should serve a community and should admit the representatives of all the various denominations to its membership. They would not lose their denominational tie, but would retain it in the fellowship of one actual congregation. A Church of one denomination might act as the Community Church or a Church representing a federation or denomination, or finally a Church formed by a union of denominations. The exposition of this broad scheme must be sought in the book, but as a matter of fact there are already a great many such Community Churches in the United States.

Few are so well qualified to write on Psychotherapy as Dr. W. Brown, who holds, along with other important offices, that of Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford. The fact is evidently widely recognized, for within

three months a second edition of his book, *Suggestion and Mental Analysis* (University of London Press ; 3s. 6d. net), has been called for. It is not a mere reprint, but an enlargement of the first edition. After explaining and criticizing various points in the theory and practice of psycho-analysis, hypnosis, and suggestion, he warns us—and the warning is timely—that the psycho-therapist ought to be a sound physician, a sound psychologist, and something of a philosopher and religious man.

The Wrath of God in the Teaching of Jesus.

By Edward Grubb, M.A., Letchworth.

Did our Lord teach that the ultimate Divine answer to human sin is the manifestation of Wrath ? Did He reveal a God whose patience with the evil in men's hearts is limited, and who, if their unrepentance exceeds the limit He has appointed, will torment or destroy them ? This is not exactly the old question of Eternal Punishment : it goes deeper. The question now asked is whether punishment itself, when all means of salvation seem to have failed, is (in the teaching of Jesus) the Divine way of finally dealing with sin.

On a superficial reading of the Gospels, the answer seems quite clear. Jesus does apparently speak repeatedly of 'outer darkness,' 'unquenchable fire,' 'wailing and gnashing of teeth,' 'the worm that dieth not,' as the portion of the finally ungodly. In the older theology this was spoken of as the 'justice' of God, which used to be contrasted with His 'mercy.' The question before us is whether the God of whom Jesus taught, and in communion with whom He lived, was thought of by Him in those terms ; and whether the idea of God as Judge and Avenger can be reconciled with the conviction of His Fatherhood.

Many Christians would probably be content to answer that Fatherhood represents *one side* of the Divine nature, and that there is a sterner one. This sterner side is revealed to us in the natural law of consequence, expressed by Paul in the memorable words : 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap ; he that soweth to his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption' (Gal $6^{7.8}$). That persistent wrong-doing leads to disaster would seem to be of the essence of a rational and moral universe ; were things arranged otherwise, there would be no corrective of human folly. The law of consequence is, in part, remedial : it is through finding out the results of evil that we learn to do better : 'a burnt child dreads the fire.' Was it this law of consequence that Jesus had in mind when (as reported) He spoke of 'unquenchable fire' ? The difficulty is that there is no hint, in any of the passages concerning Judgment attributed to Him, that the 'fire' is remedial and purgative—unless in the sense that fear of it will induce men to repent. It is always presented, in those passages of His recorded teaching, as God's *final* answer to human sin : not as chastisement but as retribution.

Is this reconcilable with His conception of the Divine Fatherhood ? All will admit that Jesus taught that the best human fatherhood we know is a clue to the character of God (Mt 7^{11}, etc.). Even the most perfect human father, we should say, must sometimes punish his children ; but, if so, he will always do it for what he believes to be their good, and not for the purpose of retribution or of matching ill-desert with pain. The question therefore is not whether Divine chastisement for man's good can be included in the conception of Fatherhood, but whether we have to set, side by side with our Lord's thought of God as Father, the other conception of God as Judge and Avenger : whether, in the mind of Jesus, God was something else as well as Father, and whether the two aspects can be reconciled.

This vitally important subject has been very ably treated by Miss Dougall and the Rev. C. W. Emmet in a book recently published, *The Lord of Thought*.[1] Their contention is, broadly, that the conception of Fatherhood covers *all* that Jesus taught of God, that the other strain of teaching is not consistent with it, and not authentically His

[1] *The Lord of Thought : A Study of the Problems which confronted Jesus Christ, and the Solution which He offered.* Student Christian Movement, 12s. 6d. net.

at all, but one that springs from Jewish eschatology. Before I had read their book, which appears to be of the very highest importance for Christian theology, my own thoughts had turned strongly in the same direction. Perhaps I may be allowed to develop them in my own way, using the book occasionally for purposes of confirmation.

Such study as I have been able to give to the New Testament writings suggests three conclusions :

(1) That Jesus was, as Matthew Arnold used to say, 'above the heads of His reporters' : that the early Church took over the penal ideas of Jewish eschatology ; and, with these thoughts in mind, misinterpreted certain features of its Master's teaching.

(2) That Jesus, while fully recognizing the evil consequences of sin, and solemnly warning His disciples of them, did not attribute these consequences to God, whose character was for Him pure and unmixed love ; and that this constituted His 'gospel.'

(3) That the ideas of Judgment suggested in the Fourth Gospel are nearer to the thoughts of Jesus than are those attributed to Him by the Synoptists, especially the first.

It is impossible in one short article to deal adequately with these conclusions ; all I can do is to indicate some of the data on which they rest, and to try to indicate their practical importance. I cannot keep the three points entirely separate in this discussion.

My own knowledge of the Jewish apocalyptic writings is scanty, but their main drift is set forth by Miss Dougall in Part I. of this book with a wealth of knowledge and illustration that leaves little to be desired. She points out that while not all pious Jews of the time of Jesus believed in a coming supernatural catastrophe, they all had 'the same underlying conception of God and man, of law and punishment,' and that many on both sides were in serious doubt and perplexity concerning the ways of God with men. (Clear evidence of this is to be found in the Apocalypse of Ezra.) What the Apocalyptists tried to do was to assure their people, in face of persecution and distress, of the final triumph of God and righteousness ; but at what a cost !

> 'The main burden of these books is the scarcity of righteous souls and God's implacable vengeance on the unrighteous. . . . The Gentiles were not thought of as ruled by a different idea of God, but as merely "ungodly." Impious Jews were even worse than ungodly. Worst of all were the Gentiles who oppressed the Jews. God was not thought of as able to overcome sin and save the sinners ; it was only by the destruction of all the ungodly and sinners that God and good could prevail.'

The authors rightly point out that this theory of Judgment required a rigid separation of all men into wholly bad and wholly good—a conception which passed over into Christian thought, but which is contrary to all our experience of men in this world.

It was into the midst of a people so taught that John the Baptist came with his preaching of repentance, as a refuge from the swiftly approaching wrath of God.[1] His message was mainly one of gloom and dread. Jesus contrasts with it His own message, as being one of gladness and joy (Mt 11^{16-19}). Could this have been so, if He also thought of God as finally the Avenging Judge ? The fact seems certain that the preaching of Jesus was felt to be indeed 'good news' ; and this can only have been because it was based on a new and truer idea of God and of His purpose for men. If He really held, with the eschatologists and John the Baptist, that it was only a few who would escape the Divine wrath, could there have been in His teaching this note of joy in God ?

In Luke (13^{1-5}), Jesus repudiates the popular notion that calamities are 'sent' by God as punishments for sin. The massacred Galileans, and the eighteen on whom the tower in Siloam fell, were not 'sinners above all.' It is true He adds, 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish' ; but the authors are surely right in interpreting this as a national and not an individual warning. If the Jewish nation went on as it was then going, the certain issue would be revolt against Rome and inevitable destruction. This national aspect of the teaching of Jesus is, happily, receiving attention now in many quarters ; and there is a growing

[1] The writers suggest (with Wellhausen) that John really spoke of his Successor as one who should baptize *with fire* ; that Mark has changed this to 'the Holy Spirit' ; and that Q has combined the two versions of his teaching. (See also Manson, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, p. 71.) I am inclined to think that John was rather more truly a forerunner of Jesus than the authors seem to allow.

belief that His fundamental teaching about the necessity of the forgiveness of enemies has, as its primary reference, national forgiveness of the Roman oppressors. However this may be, He clearly taught that men must forgive because God forgives. He saw that God is 'kind toward the unthankful and evil' (Lk 6^{35}), and men must share God's spirit of universal love. He desired national as well as individual repentance, that His nation might take up the missionary service which the greatest of the prophets had foretold for it, and become 'a light to the Gentiles' (Is 49^{6}).

But what, now, of His warnings of doom? These are the subject of very careful study by Mr. Emmet in Part III. of the book. It is shown that the bulk of these warnings of Divine punishment are in the First Gospel; and evidence is brought to prove that its author has interpreted, in accordance with his own ideas about 'Judgment,' passages which in Mark and Luke are much less eschatological in tone.[1] It is in the explanation of parables that Matthew finds the chief opportunity for these warnings, and many of these explanations should probably be attributed to him and not to Jesus. As is pointed out in the footnote below, Luke is much less 'eschatological' than Matthew. Was this because as a Gentile Christian he was not interested in eschatology, and therefore toned down the teaching of Jesus, or was he nearer to its true meaning? Mr. Emmet pleads for the second view. After careful inquiry he sums up thus:

> 'It appears then that Luke has no particular bias against eschatology as such, but simply follows his sources. This conclusion is of the greatest importance for our whole investigation. . . . Seeing that Luke retains the eschatology of Mark and of his sources in Acts, there is no reason to suppose that he deliberately cut it out from Q. We follow him rather than Matthew as giving us the truer report of Christ's teaching where the two overlap.'

We may remember it is Luke who gives us the principle of Divine justice, that he who knew not his lord's will is to be beaten with few stripes ($12^{47.\ 48}$); and who makes Jesus, when reading from Is 61 in the synagogue at Nazareth, stop short of the words, 'and the day of vengeance of our God' (4^{19}). In the priceless parables which he gives us from his special source, there is (except in Dives and Lazarus) almost no eschatology.

Finally, we have to reckon with the Fourth Gospel, to which in some respects the third makes an approach. I dealt with its Eschatology in an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. xxviii. p. 308), and need only now recall that Judgment is there presented, sometimes at least, not as a future event in time, but 'as a present and perennial experience, as something inherent in the very fact that new moral truth is revealed, and as irrevocably bound up with the way a man uses the revelation. . . . The "world" is not to be destroyed but "overcome."'[2] If it is possible to think of the author as an actual companion of Jesus, he would seem to have caught his Master's meaning better than any one else; and, if not, it is perhaps no extravagance to believe that that meaning was revealed to him by the Spirit. In either case it is difficult to think that he had more insight into truth, and more sobriety of outlook, than Jesus Himself.

The importance of these conclusions, if they are in the direction of the truth, can hardly be exaggerated. Should they meet with general acceptance,

[1] In Mark's Gospel there are (I believe) only four passages concerning the final Judgment, all of which appear also in Matthew. They are Mk 3^{29} (=Mt 12^{31}, Lk 12^{10}); Mk 8^{38} (=Mt 16^{27}, Lk 9^{26}); Mk 9^{43-48} (=Mt $5^{29.\ 30}$ and $18^{8.\ 9}$, not Lk.), and Mk 12^{9} (=Mt 21^{41}, Lk 20^{16}). The 'little Apocalypse' in Mk 13 is, in parts at least, of doubtful authenticity, and clearly refers mainly to the destruction of Jerusalem. Besides these Marcan passages there appear to be eighteen others of a similar character in Matthew, of which seven only are paralleled in Luke. The terrible denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, which occupies nearly the whole of Mt 23, is in Mark condensed into three verses (12^{38-40}), and is much milder in tone. The lesson drawn from the withering of the fig-tree in Mk 11^{20-25} is not, as might have been expected, Judgment, but faith, prayer, and forgiveness. Luke has three passages referring to future punishment (in addition to $13^{3.\ 5}$, already alluded to) which are his alone: 13^{9}, 16^{19-31} and $19^{14.\ 27}$. The last appear to be portions of a lost parable which has been confused with the Parable of the Pounds.

[2] In other words, the deeper teaching of the Fourth Gospel is that Judgment is not God's personal act, but is an outcome of the necessary constitution of the universe. It is not possible here to discuss this great and difficult subject; but I earnestly commend Miss Dougall's two central chapters on the teaching of Jesus concerning consequence and concerning forgiveness.

the Christian Church will gain, for the first time in its history, a consistent thought of God as love and nothing else; and it will recognize that this is due entirely to its Founder. The moral and social and international effects of such a revolution in the general conception of God are almost incalculable. As Miss Dougall says:

> 'Whatever a man thinks his God is and does, he seeks to be and do, and generally succeeds. If his gods are sexually immoral, such is he, and that even in his worship. If his God is a God of war, he is truculent. If God is one among many, and jealous, unable to abide other gods, His followers are jealous of the prestige of any nation but their own, unable to abide other nations. If God is conceived as the One Absolute Reality, rational but impassible, man holds himself above human joys and sorrows in Stoic aloofness. . . . If God's holiness consists in the vindictive punishment of wrong, and His glory consists in the power to coerce His creature into obedience, human civilization will express itself in a penal code and will be founded on military force. . . . A penal code cannot command obedience, as the Jews discovered; but a Living Love, give it time and scope, does adapt men to the good life. Love is thus higher and more majestic than law, for it rules free spirits. It is the only power that can leave men free while yet it controls their actions.'

Jesus Christ met the evil of the world not by overwhelming it with supernatural force, but by going to the Cross. If He was really Divine, then His way of overcoming evil is God's way; and it must be man's way too.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A New Departure in the Investigation of the Synoptic Gospels.[1]

It is difficult, in a brief review, to give an idea of the significance of this book. Professor Bultmann, whose reputation is established among the younger scholars of Germany, has here set himself to the important task of attempting to get behind the Synoptic Gospels as we have them and to analyse the process by which they reached their present form. The inquiry is one which must often have appealed to New Testament investigators, and, whatever may be thought of its results, it is at least a real advantage to be shown clearly the various difficulties involved.

Bultmann examines the material with extreme minuteness under two main headings, the 'Tradition of the Words of Jesus' and the 'Tradition of Narrative Matter.' The former division is subdivided into (*a*) a group which he names Apophthegmata, *i.e.* passages 'whose point consists in a word of Jesus apprehended in a brief framework'; (*b*) words of the Lord (Logia in the strict sense, prophetic and apocalyptic words, legal words and regulations for the Church, I-words, and parables). The second division embraces (*a*) miracle stories, and (*b*) historical narratives and legends. Bultmann's standpoint is that the first Gospel writer, Mark, must have found a number of isolated traditions floating about, and he tries to show in detail how the evangelist constructed them into the form in which we have them in the Gospel. But he also analyses what he conceives to be those separate, isolated passages with the most laborious thoroughness. A glance at the register of passages from the Synoptic Gospels (for he applies a similar treatment to Matthew and Luke) reveals the astounding pains he has spent on the analysis.

It may at once be admitted that over and over again his analysis brings out most interesting and instructive results. Take, *e.g.*, the very difficult passage, Mt 5^{17-19}. Bultmann thinks that the passage goes back to the discussion between the more conservative (Palestinian) and the more liberal (Hellenistic) section of the early Christian community. '$\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\nu o\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$ shows that v.[17] arose from debate. . . . V.[18] in its formulation of principles and in its antagonism to primary tradition can

[1] *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition.* By R. Bultmann, Professor in Giessen. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1921. Pp. x, 229. Price 9s.

only be a Church-formation, and v.[19] cannot be a polemic against Jewish teachers of the law, but only against the Hellenists' (pp. 83, 84). Noteworthy is the elaborate representation of the fundamental form of proverbs and Logia from the O.T., and the full tables which follow of parallels in the Synoptic Gospels. The remarkable kinship is unmistakable. But from beginning to end the analysis reveals an extraordinary subjectivity. Typical of the author's position is the statement, 'in general the words have created the situation, not vice versa.' The vast majority of the situations commented on are described as 'ideal,' *i.e.* the product of the earliest community. Now most students of the Gospels would be willing to admit that the dominant Messianic convictions of the early Church must often have coloured the accounts of events given in the Gospels. But Bultmann seems to set no bounds to his critical incredulity. He goes the length of regarding the story of the centurion of Capernaum (Mt 8^{5-13}|| Lk 7^{1-10}) as a variant of that of the Syrophœnician woman (Mt 7^{24-31} and parallels). He shows the utmost scepticism as to all kinds of details. Thus, *e.g.*, the story of the call of the first disciples, placed at the Lake of Galilee, probably takes this form from the metaphor used by Jesus when He names them 'fishers of men.' The account of the call of Levi has no historical value: 'the only interest felt by the tradition was that a tax-collector was summoned from his occupation to follow Jesus: *where* Levi was tax-collector, we do not hear' (p. 35). This meticulousness is surely artificial. What traditions in the world could submit to such a process? One cannot help feeling that the author ought to have laid down certain criteria for the testing of the material. Because he has not, his procedure is reduced largely to guess-work.

With justice Bultmann calls attention to the activity of the Church in the *redaction* of the material, 'a redaction which essentially, but by no means only, belongs to the period when it took shape in writing' (p. 89). He shows most instructively how the grouping of passages necessitated such redaction, pointing out the actual words and phrases used by the evangelists to accomplish their purpose. Indeed, we get a very vivid picture of the process of composition on pp. 200–204.

The volume closes with an exceedingly interesting characterization of the three Synoptic Gospels, in which the author gives it as his opinion that Mark used no source which could be called a Gospel, that Matthew adheres to Mark's fundamental picture of the life of Jesus, that Luke's main deviation is the large section beginning with chap. 9^{51}, which he introduced both because he felt the need of illuminating Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem more clearly than Mark had done, and because he found in this an opportunity of recording all sorts of passages which had no particular situation.

We are more than ever convinced of the far-reaching problems which confront the investigator who enters the fascinating realm of the traditions behind the Synoptic Gospels.

H. A. A. Kennedy.

Edinburgh.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Blasting without Powder.[1]

'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.'—Ph 4^{13}.

You know about the Roman Wall? You'll find it in the very first pages of your history book. No! no! before Alfred. No, further back than Mercia and all the other six of them, away back at the first three or four pages, it's there you'll come on the great wall built to keep out the wild northern clans and tribes ever so long ago, yet built so splendidly and solidly that there are bits of it there still, and you can follow it almost from sea to sea, and come upon the camps where the old battalions had their quarters, and see the ruts in the pavements made by the Roman chariots, and the baths where the great people used to bathe, and many another thing. I've never seen it, but I understand that there is a deep trench that runs along for many miles on one side of the wall; and at one place this trench comes up against a huge mass of rock, one of the very hardest kinds of rock,

[1] By the Rev. Arthur J. Gossip.

that lies there full in its way. This must be the end, you and I would have said. For how can they get through? They had no instruments and machinery, as have the engineers to-day; no dynamite or blasting powder. They can't do it, we would have said. And yet they did. And how? Well, I'm told that they bored round holes into the rock, one here, one a foot or two further on, a long line of them: and that they plugged them with wood, and then poured water on the wood; and that made it swell, and when the wood in all the holes pressed out together all at once it burst the rock and split it, and allowed the trench to run right through.

And that is the way for you and me to manage to get through our difficulties. Take lessons, take those dreadful verbs, Latin or French or Greek. You feel you will never get them up. The other night you had a dozen of them and you worked hard. But at school you jumbled them all up, *cado* and *cædo* and *cedo*; and you are only at *c* as yet, and there are pages and pages still to come. You'll never manage. Yes, you will. Even though you have no dynamite to blow it all to bits; even though you aren't clever, but slow and a bit dull and dreadfully forgetful, bore your small hole every night. It will seem to make no difference in the mile or so of solid rock. Yet bore one on Monday, and another on Tuesday, and a third on Wednesday, and a fourth on Thursday, and another on Friday, and night by night one more, and by and by the rock will crack right through.

And so with other things—sulks, ill-nature, all the rest of them. There's not one you can't master. There is nothing need pull you up. You think you can't break down these things; so did Paul. He had worked hard, had picked and dug, and picked and dug, and had nothing to show for it except his sore shoulders and tired arms. The sulks and the rest were not worn away one bit. But he came on a great Engineer called Jesus Christ, and He showed him how to manage.

These soldiers must have thought the trench could go no further. Ah, but, said their engineer, we'll manage, rock or no rock, and they did—little by little, bit by bit, one small hole and then another. And you must not think that you can't conquer anything. Alone you couldn't do it. But our wise Engineer will help us, if we do our part. You're just a hot, peppery, peevish little chap. But you needn't remain that. Day by day do your best to conquer it; meet this temptation in the playground when you get hacked, and then this one in bed when you're sleepy and you ought to rise, and then this one when you can't be bothered doing lessons, and then the next, just one temptation at a time. Stand up to it, conquer it, bore this small round hole in the rock, and then another, and another, and one more. And by and by it will split right across, and you will be through.

God's Marks.

'His name shall be in their foreheads.'—Rev 22[4].

The Hindu lives a great deal in the invisible world; that is to say, he withdraws himself from this, just as, I dare say, your mother sometimes does—with a difference of course. You speak to her at times, and she does not answer at once: you speak again and she seems to wake up. She probably just says, 'I was thinking.' It would be much more difficult to bring the Hindu back to earth. Even if you succeeded in doing it, you would not be able to persuade him to tell you anything about where he had been. I believe he thinks that his pet animals are sharers of the rewards that come to people for having done good deeds. And you would not understand him even if he did tell you. Hindus think so differently from us. To the Hindu the cow is a deity, and there are other animals that he imagines are on a higher plane than himself.

If you happened to pay a visit to India, and were admitted to an Indian house, you would see animals of all kinds running about everywhere. Amongst them would probably be a pretty little tame squirrel having grey fur marked with dark brown stripes. The Indian has a great reverence for this squirrel. There is a beautiful Indian story that tells how the brown stripes came to be on its back. It runs thus: The god Ram wanted to build a bridge between India and Ceylon, and the larger animals were all eager to have a share in so important an undertaking and set to work, the elephants bringing down large pieces of rock, and the oxen and buffaloes and donkeys bearing their several burdens. The little squirrels saw all this, and were determined to do their bit, so they took counsel together as to what their share should be, and thought of a plan. They went down to the sea and bathed, and then rubbed them-

selves in the sand, which stuck to their wet fur. After this they sunned themselves till the sand was dry, and then shook it all off into a heap. They repeated this time after time and collected quite a large pile of sand, and when the time came for the bridge to be built, the sand was all ready for the mortar. The monkeys went to tell the god Ram of the work of the little squirrels, and Ram was so greatly pleased that he sent for the squirrels and stroked them in commendation; and the Hindus say that the stripes are the marks of the god Ram's fingers.

You probably think it is rather a stupid story. That is a mistake, for don't we in this country often hear one with the same idea in it, only ours is very much finer? Picture to yourselves those graceful creatures dancing about and doing their piece of helpful work entirely unconscious of doing anything specially good. The god Ram saw and set his mark upon them.

Our Scouts and the boys of the Brigade are banded together in their effort to be truly manly—to serve God and the King, and to try to do some kind action every day, especially to those weaker than themselves. It was a bit hard at first, was it not? You had to remember every time you performed an act of courtesy or kindness. You learned to pray for help to get rid of your selfishness and meanness! You had to plant good qualities in their place. Now your kind action is performed as a matter of course.

And the marks are placed upon many lads. People say, 'I know a *Scout* when I see him; he has a certain look about him.' 'The Scouts and Brigade boys are growing up to make the world better—to help to build the bridge between earth and heaven.'

An eminent London photographer wrote an article for a learned paper. In it he said that 'one of the best evidences for religion is the type of face it produces.' 'His name shall be in their foreheads.' A little girl was one day reading the Bible, and she came upon those words. 'I don't understand that,' she said to her grandfather. 'Who will write the name of Jesus on their foreheads?' 'Why, they write it themselves, of course.' 'Write it *themselves*, grandfather! But how?' 'Why, Margery, we are every day writing the name of our Master on our foreheads. Some people make a mistake and serve sin, and it stamps its seal upon their faces. Some serve care, and care brands their foreheads with deep wrinkles. But those who love Jesus Christ and walk with Him, and do His will, write the name of their Master on their foreheads. They cannot help it.' Margery looked at her grandfather. She noticed how his grey hair was like a crown of glory. She noticed more than that; she looked into his eyes. He had a beautiful face. The problem of the name in the forehead was solved for her. She said softly and reverently, 'I think I understand, grandfather.'

The Christian Year.

Sixth Sunday after Epiphany.

The Awesomeness of Forgiveness.

'But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.'—Ps 130^4.

1. It is good hearing that there is *forgiveness with God*. For that fact of God meets the need of man, which man most widely recognizes, whether he claims and rests in the forgiveness that is offered or no.

> Lips cry, 'God be merciful,'
> That ne'er cried, 'God be praised.'

'There is forgiveness with God.'

(1) How *simple* the word is: every one can understand it. Every one knows what is meant when an earthly father forgives his child. He answers him that he will no longer remember his sins, will not impute the evil experienced, and will not punish him. He will deal with the child as if he had done no harm.

(2) How *sure* the word is. Every one may believe it. Jesus came from heaven to obtain and to seal it for us. His blood is the pledge of it. Thousands of the greatest sinners can support the truth of the cry: 'With God there is forgiveness.'

(3) How *powerful* the word is. It is living; it will cause hope to rise in your soul. It will inspire you with new thoughts about God; it will instil into you confidence and boldness before Him. Lay up this word in your heart, give it a place there, think over it, and say in spoken words before your God: 'Lord, with thee there is forgiveness.' Insensibly you will get up to saying: 'With Thee there is forgiveness *also for me*.'[1]

2. 'There is forgiveness with thee, *that thou*

[1] A. Murray, *Why do you not Believe?* 30.

mayest be feared.' That is an unexpected conclusion. Forgiven in order to fear. Does it not seem a poor and pitiful way of stating the issues of God's mercy? Should it not rather be, forgiven, therefore hoping, loving, rejoicing? But the Psalmist is not mistaken. '*That thou mayest be feared*' is not unintelligible, as has been avowed. He shows indeed deep psychological insight.

What is this fear? It is not dread. It is not the feeling which makes a man flee in the hour of danger. It is the emotion of reverent awe. It is the kind of fear which to a greater or less extent has formed part of the experience of every life, the fear of the unknown; which is common to the child crying in the dark, and the saint stretched on his death-bed, and is felt whenever we allow our minds to wander over unexplored regions, whether of mere anticipation, or of thought, speculation, and faith.

God forgives in order that men may fear. And forgiveness is meaningless, unless sin be a reality. God has marked and does mark what is done amiss, and the fear of God begins at a point further back than the forgiveness which He offers: it begins, or should begin, with the thought of the sin for which forgiveness is needed. We can abide the wrath of God only because He forgives: yet how small is the number of those who remember and fear that wrath, when sin is committed, before the thought of forgiveness or of the need for it has crossed their minds. This attribute of God meets with scant acceptance by some. But it is worth while to inquire whether—in some systems of religion—there remain any attributes of God at all. If the doctrine of God's immanence be isolated from that of His transcendence, and if that isolation be pressed to the extent to which some would carry it, the Personality of God disappears, and there is no place whatever for a Supreme Moral Power in the Universe. It is not only the wrath of God, but also His Power, His Holiness, His Love—all His attributes—which are in danger of being lost in a cloud of words and phrases to-day. And would it not have helped *Mr. Britling* to have sat under the Gifford Lecturer who, at the beginning of his course, laid down this clear proposition? 'When I speak of God, I mean something other than an Identity wherein all differences vanish, or a Unity which includes but does not transcend the differences which it somehow holds in solution. I mean a God Whom men can love, a God to Whom men can pray, Who takes sides, Who has purposes and preferences, Whose attributes, howsoever conceived, leave unimpaired the possibility of a personal relation between Himself and those whom He has created.'[1]

But if it be granted that we are not degrading God, when we attempt in human language to describe His Nature, the question will still remain whether a God of Love can also be a God of Wrath. Certainly, if anger be merely the outcome of a fitful ill-temper, then we should indeed be doing God great dishonour if we were to associate any such attribute with His character. But if it be the expression of a righteous disapproval (as we find it manifested in the life of our Blessed Lord), then it is hard to see how a loving and a Holy God can be true to His Nature if He has never felt that disapproval, when He sees the havoc wrought in the world which He made so fair.

But it is not the fear before forgiveness that the text speaks of. It is the fear after forgiveness. That God can give us the sense of guilt, of alienation, when we have sinned is something for which we should never cease to thank Him. That He can as truly remove that sense of guilt, that He can forgive us again and again, should cause us to feel not only thanksgiving, but fear.

For surely before forgiving love a reverent awe is bound to rise in the minds of incomplete and sinful men, who still desire greatness of soul at its highest. It is an emotion which has a double element in it. It contains (1) a simple appreciation of splendour as splendour: and (2) a wistful appreciation of another's reach and grasp as far exceeding ours. Always in face of goodness a complex emotion of that kind must arise in our hearts, if we desire goodness at all.

And further, when we have come to know the means by which it pleased God to make forgiveness possible for us, still more shall we realize the need of Holy Fear. We cannot picture, in all its terrible details, the scene of the Crucifixion, but we know the effect it had upon some of those who stood by. They 'feared greatly,' and one of them said, 'Truly this was the Son of God.' And because He died that we might be forgiven, the pardon which is bestowed upon us can never be separated, in our minds, from that scene. The Hand that is raised to bestow the Blessing of Forgiveness is a pierced Hand. We cannot dissociate the joy of Absolution from the fearfulness of Calvary. The warning of

[1] A. J. Balfour, *Theism and Humanism*, 21.

St. Peter is surely clear on this point: 'Pass the time of your sojourning here in fear; forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious Blood of Christ.' [1]

Forgivenesss first, godly fear second, and thirdly a consecrated will, for the issue of godly fear is a life of consecrated will.

SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY.

Vocation.

'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'—Ac 9[6].

There is no such thing as salvation except as a man is saved from a self-regarding point of view to another-regarding attitude and point of view. In a conversation in the presence of Mazzini the subject of goodness was being discussed, and some one in his hearing talked about a mutual friend of theirs as being religious and good. Mazzini said: 'Whenever I hear a man called good, I ask, "Who, then, has he saved?"' An artist was painting a picture once in his studio, and the picture was a picture of a poor woman out in the night, thinly clad, tossed by the tempest and hard driven, hugging a little baby to her breast. He thought as he painted, and as he painted he suddenly flung down his brush and said, 'God help me; why don't I, instead of painting pictures of lost people, go and help them myself?' That man was as good as his word. He did go and help them himself. He set out for Africa as soon as he could, because he discovered that, as far as he could see, the most needy people in the world at that time were to be found in that continent, and for the last twenty-five years of his life Alfred Tucker (for that was his name) was a missionary in Uganda.

What are we going to do? We must share our life. Every man who means to share will each morning take a fresh look at his ideal not to be ministered unto but to minister, to be last of all and servant of all—for it is more blessed to give than to receive—and he will look at his Master too to take in a new stock of hope and courage, and then he will plunge recklessly and cheerily into a day of service. In the give and take of family life he will do plenty of giving. Then in all the traffic of common intercourse in the street, in the bus, in the shop, office, workroom, at the playing-fields, it will be for such a man a never-ending delight, like a secret game played with himself, to devise all sorts of ways in which to carry out his sharing scheme.

1. *Share it in material and external things* to begin with. All men need life, physical and spiritual, the material environment, the material setting as well as the thing itself which we call life. Millions in the world are going short of it, and there is no ghost of a chance of most people in the world having even an opportunity to get life, using the word in its largest sense, unless and until those who have a closer access to it are more ready to share. Do you not think that if we meant business by being followers of Jesus Christ it would be for us all a point of honour not to have more than our fair share of the good things in this world?

The question is beset with difficulties. And yet when all has been said and done and every qualification has been made, when there are so many millions of people so desperately in need of even the bare necessities of life, cannot we get a bit closer to the ideal of not more than a fair share? 'We are polite enough,' it has been said, 'to surrender our seat in a bus to another weaker person, but rarely our seat in the saddle of wealth and privilege. Convention gives us each our place and advantage, and we have tried to argue that God meant us each to keep our seats in the world's bus, trusting that He would make other people's standing and pushing congenial to them. We have abandoned the idea of loving our neighbour as ourselves, covering ourselves forsooth with the theological defence of caring more for our brother's soul than his body.' But you remember what the Master said about the people of grace, and the people who were withheld from grace: 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'

2. There is more to do than that. What we as Christians have got to *share* most of all is *the very quality and stuff of which the best in our life is made up*. We will do that sharing whether we will or no. The saint has been defined as one who makes it easier for other people to believe in God. God gives Himself to people through people, and unquestionably there are persons who are waiting to get something of God through us.

In the main the Church is not doing its job in giving Jesus Christ to the hungry folk. And the mischief lies in our own lives, because men cannot see Christ in them. God forgive us that right within the Church there is so much coldness about Jesus

[1] F. A. Iremonger, *Before the Morning Watch*, 75.

Christ. We as Christians are called not to be cold about Christ, but to catch from Him a burning fire, the kind of passion that can set a light to all the fuel that is in the hearts of men and women around us. We can, if we will, get so close to Him, and live so close to Him, and let Him set our heart on fire, that men shall see in us something which will lead them to Jesus Christ. It will mean a clearing out of a lot of rubbish; it will mean making the door open that He may come clean in; it will mean not counting the cost if the spirit of Christ is going to make His home in our personality. If we are prepared, not counting the cost, to say the thing shall be done, then God will be able to use us.[1]

SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY.

Teacher, Saviour, Friend.

'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.'—He 13^{8} (R.V.).

The Hebrew Christians to whom these words were addressed had hung upon the messages of men who watched for their souls; the living example, also, of their leaders had been a constant incentive to well-doing, and the faith which shone in their whole life, and breathed through all their words, had been an inspiration. Now they were bereft. Yet not bereft; for He in whom they had thus been taught to believe, who was the end and aim of those faithful ministrations, was the same—'the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.'

Though since then the weary ages have rolled away, His years have not failed. Though all things else are in ceaseless fluctuation and change, He abides. Yesterday and to-day, to-day and henceforth, He is the abiding Teacher, Saviour, Friend.

1. First, Jesus Christ is our *Teacher*. It is natural to the human mind to hunger for the truth. This desire is strong or weak, in proportion to the general alertness of the mind, or its lassitude; and in proportion as the intellectual faculties are not kept in abeyance by the indulging of appetite, or made merely tributary to selfish ends, whether of gain or of pleasure. In the case of those who are more serious and earnest, in whom conscience holds its proper place, and speaks with its full force, this general desire to know becomes more especially a craving to know what is right, to learn the truth of duty. And where the soul is touched to yet finer issues by the Spirit of God, this longing becomes still more defined and intensely personal: 'that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead' (Ph $3^{10, 11}$).

This need of the human mind is fully met by Jesus Christ. 'Jesus went about . . . teaching': so does St. Matthew describe our Lord's opening ministry (4^{23}). 'Seeing the multitudes, he went up into the mountain: and he opened his mouth, and taught them' (5^{1}). But did not such work fill all the busy days? 'The Teacher' was perhaps His most familiar designation. Moreover, the truths that He taught were truths of duty. With a sure hand, He delineated the great principles of conduct and character, as they have never else been made known among men. Over the portals of the Kingdom of Heaven He inscribed the Beatitudes, sparkling as with all manner of precious stones; and He pointed the people to the straitened way of righteousness, as 'the way that leadeth into life.' But, in His teaching, the way of righteousness was ever the way of faith. He taught men that only by trusting and loving God could they become truly good. Thus He met the spiritual hunger of the mind by speaking of the Kingdom of God. At last, gathering up into one weighty word all this significance of His ministry, and expressing besides the essential significance of Himself, as being One whom most of all it concerned men to know, He said, 'I am the truth.'

'Christ,' says Mr. Clutton-Brock, 'was not a philosopher; if you speak of His teaching you seem to do Him a wrong, as if you spoke of the teaching of Mozart. He does not prove to us, He reveals; and what we say is—not even, That is true, but—That is what I wish to be.'[2]

2. Again, Jesus Christ is our *Saviour*. Deeper and more fundamental than the need of knowledge is the need of salvation. If the mind craves for truth, so does the conscience, either clamorously or mutely, cry for appeasement and cleansing. Indeed, in proportion as we learn the law of righteousness, do we learn how far we have gone astray from the way of God's will, and how grievously we have broken His commands. The more clearly we discern the beauty of holiness, and the sacredness of God's claims upon our trust and love, the

[1] E. S. Woods, in *The Christian Call and Motive*, 156.

[2] *Studies in Christianity*, 69.

more are we convicted of our alienation from God by an evil heart of unbelief. Nor is the evil an evil which it is within our own power to remedy. We cannot, by ever so little, undo the guilt of the past; nor can we loose ourselves from the present bondage of the soul to sin's tyrannous power. Our utmost struggling does but bring home to us the fact that we are hopelessly undone and lost. We need a Divine salvation.

This need, above all, is met by Jesus Christ. More important than the teaching was the preaching of Jesus Christ, and He preached Himself as the Saviour. Listen to His manifesto as made known to His fellow-townsmen of Nazareth. 'He opened the book, and found the place where it was written,

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. . . .

And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears' (Lk 4^{17-21}). His wonderful works among the people were an object-lesson of His power to save. He came among them everywhere as the Healer and Helper, and they felt that a new power of God was in their midst, laying itself alongside their sin and misery, bringing truest sympathy and strong salvation. Let them be ever so outcast and abandoned, He brought to their despair so great a hope, and did so melt them into contrite shame by the Divine pity and purity of His love, that they fell weeping at His feet, only to hear Him say, 'Thy sins are forgiven . . . thy faith hath saved thee' (Lk $7^{48.\ 50}$). And He published it abroad, as the justification of all His manner of life, 'For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost' (19^{10}). Even as to the disciples at last, expressing again in one word the whole meaning of His redeeming grace, and anticipating the great reconcilement of the Cross, He said, 'I am the way'—the way by which guilty, estranged, polluted sinners may come home to God.

When Phillips Brooks was about to preach in Westminster Abbey, Dean Stanley asked him what he was going to preach about. His reply was, 'I have but one subject—the Divine life of the Saviour of men.' [1]

3. Once more, Jesus Christ is our *Friend*. It is natural to the heart of man to hunger for love. We are full of longings that can find rest only in fellowship and affection. Our souls are not self-sufficing or self-satisfying. We need one another, and this not merely in the sense that we need one another's help: we need the revelation of heart to heart, the converse of soul with soul. But, having intercourse with one another, we still crave for deeper, tenderer, more intimate fellowship. And even when we have found our nearest and most confidential friendships, we crave for yet fuller satisfaction than the heart can find in the best and truest human friendships and affections—even for the friendship of the Infinite, for fellowship with God.

This Divine satisfaction Jesus brings to men. He came to woo them, and to win them. It was this yearning affection for the people that commended the grace of God to their hearts. And in proportion as they were receptive of His love, He loved them with a love ever fuller and more intimate. 'Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus' (Jn 11^{5}); 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (21^{20}): so intensely did His heart's affection concentrate itself on those who were able to receive it! And the great assurance to which all His teaching and all His saving grace led the way, and which He bequeathed to the disciples as their precious possession for ever, was the word uttered on that ever to be remembered last night, in the Upper Room, 'Ye are my friends.' Was it not also in reference to this same making known of His uttermost love, a love sealed in sacrificial death, but triumphing over sin and death, that He said, 'I am the life'? [2]

The friendship of Jesus Christ seems to have been to Thomas à Kempis something more than His *love*. By it he means the love of Christ in daily companionship and intimate intercourse: 'When Jesus is present, all is well, and no labour seems difficult. When He is absent, the least difficulty is found to be insupportable. When Jesus is silent, all comfort withers away; but the moment He speaks again, though but a single word, the soul

[1] J. Gregory, *Phillips Brooks*, 129.
[2] T. F. Lockyer, *Seeking a Country*, 160.

rises from her distress, and feels her comfort revive in greater power.'

I know Thee, Saviour, who Thou art,
Jesus, the feeble sinner's Friend;
Nor wilt Thou with the night depart,
But stay and love me to the end:
Thy mercies never shall remove;
Thy nature and Thy name is Love.

QUINQUAGESIMA SUNDAY.

Walk in Love.

'Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us.'—Eph 5^2.

The word 'walk' is used three times in this chapter. Each time we are told to walk in a particular way. In the fifteenth verse we are told to walk 'circumspectly.' In the eighth verse we are told to walk as 'children of light.' And in this verse we are encouraged to 'walk in love.' 'Walking' is a common expression in the Bible for our way of living, our conduct. It is a graphic expression, for all life is movement, and the question for us is, How are we moving? How are we walking?

1. We must walk circumspectly. The word translated circumspectly means, literally, 'accurately'—it means paying attention to little things. In business a merchant, to be successful, must attend to the details of business. It is the same all through life. If a man is to get on in any trade or profession he must not consider the little things beneath his notice.

And it is the same in the Christian life. How many Christians are spoken of with a 'but'! He is a good sort of man, 'but' he drives a very hard bargain. But when the Apostle exhorted to walk 'accurately,' the fault he probably referred to was a lack of strict truthfulness. He does not refer to our lying. He is thinking rather of a habit of exaggeration. See, then, he says, that ye walk accurately.

2. But he also tells us that we should walk as children of light. That is a greater thing than walking circumspectly. It means knowing where we are going. To 'walk in darkness' is the ordinary expression in the Bible for being blind to the great issues in life. Many of those who walk circumspectly, paying attention to all the little details of business, are all the time walking in darkness, for they are walking according to the light of this world. To walk in the light is to live according to the mind of Christ. 'I am the light of the world,' He said, 'he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

3. Then there is the walking of our text—walk in love. That goes deeper still. It gives the motive of all life, and it states the atmosphere in which all our life is to be carried on. If we walk in love we are walking in the light, and we shall be able to walk circumspectly. So the Apostle gives us the strongest possible encouragement to walk in love, for he knows, and we know, that everything depends upon it. 'Walk in love,' he says, 'even as Christ loved you and gave himself for you.'

How did Christ love? He did not confine His love to His own family. He commanded His followers to love their enemies. He Himself did what He commanded them to do. Even when He hung upon the Cross and heard the horrible cry of a multitude, 'Crucify him, crucify him,' He said, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.'

What is the measure of this love of Christ's? 'He gave himself for us,' says Paul. The words are simple, but they carry a tremendous meaning. They mean that Christ came into the world for the very purpose of bringing us back to God, and He knew that the only way of doing that was to give Himself for us. He lived for us, and He died for us. Up to the very end of Christ's life His disciples still regarded each other as rivals. But when He died all that completely changed. Peter *did* love John then, and Philip loved Bartholomew, for now the very spirit of Christ entered into them.

The disciples knew that He had given Himself for them—an offering and a sacrifice to God. Why does Paul add the words 'an offering and a sacrifice'? He is using language which was familiar to his readers. They brought offerings and they also brought sacrifices to the temple. The purpose of the offerings was to thank God for His goodness in bestowing the blessings of life. A few sheaves of corn were offered by way of thanking God for the harvest. It was a kind of worship; it was the expression of their daily obedience and thankfulness. Christ gave Himself as such an offering to God. He offered His life. Day by day He expressed His obedience to the Father's will in the acts of love which He did—He healed the sick; He preached the gospel to the poor.

The sacrifice was a more costly thing than the daily offering. It meant death. The offering was

a tribute of each day's devotion; the sacrifice was the act of that high hour when what is dearer than life may have to be laid down. When we follow the life of Jesus from the cradle in Bethlehem through all the years in Nazareth, and the ministry in Galilee, and Samaria, and Judea, we understand the making of the offering to God. But when we come to Calvary and look up into the face of Christ we understand the sacrifice.

So we all come to the hour when we must give up some hope; refuse some earthly advancement; take up some burden which will make our steps heavy and slow to the end; accept our cross not merely with resignation but, if possible, also with joy. No sacrifice is ever made which is not the sacrifice of love.

We have an illustration of that in the story of Captain Scott's last expedition to the Antarctic. The little band were making their way back across the trackless fields of snow. Their food was scanty. Their dogs were famishing. One of the company whose record was one of exceptional bravery and tenderness felt that he could no longer bear his share in the common task. He would only be a burden to the others. His companions roused him to continue. For a few miles more he struggled on. Then the end came. As Mr. Turley says in 'The Voyages of Captain Scott': 'He slept through the night before last, hoping not to wake; but he woke in the morning—yesterday. It was blowing a blizzard. He said, "I am just going outside and may be some time." He went out into the blizzard, and we have not seen him since. . . . We knew that poor Oates was walking to his death.' That is love that thinks not of itself, that cares only for others in its hour of sacrifice.

Can we follow Christ in sacrifice? Can we offer ourselves a sacrifice to God? We can certainly make an offering to God. By daily acts of kindness we can express our thankfulness to Him for the daily gifts of His love. But we can also make our sacrifice to God. We can offer ourselves to Him. Not our work only, not our words, but ourselves. And the way to offer ourselves to God, the only acceptable way, is simply to love Him. He prefers the love of the heart to all the deeds of the hand. We ought certainly to say, as Paul himself said, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' but first of all we must say, 'Lord, *have* me, *take* me, *receive* me in Christ Jesus. As Thou has given Thyself for me, I give myself to Thee.' It is only then that we are able to walk in love as Christ loved us.

First Sunday in Lent.

The Temptation.

'And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan.'—Mk $1^{12,13}$ (R.V.).

1. *The inevitableness of temptation.*—The Spirit, who only just previously found its symbol in the form of a dove, now reveals powers of stern compulsion and 'straightway' drives Him into the wilderness. What a startling change for our Lord Jesus Christ, from the rapture in the waters of Jordan to the solitude and the duel of the desert! What a converging of the supreme forces of good and evil round the lonely figure of Him who has come to fulfil all righteousness on our behalf! The Divine Spirit urges Him out and on to the scene of temptation; and there the wicked spirit assails Him with the subtle craft and the tremendous appeal of temptation itself.

Note that it was the dove Spirit that drove Him into the wilderness. It was not the impulsion of an alien power. It was not the flaming sword of the enemy which drove the Nazarene away from Jordan's green and quiet banks. It was the great Lover who led the Beloved from the feast to the fight. Jordan and wilderness are both parts of the same Divine plan.

Jordan and wilderness! What would life be like if it were all Jordan, with open heavens and descending doves and voices of exquisite love? Suppose we never had a nut to crack, suppose all the nuts came to us as shelled kernels, the hard encasements having been broken by other hands. Suppose we had no problems. Suppose it was all Jordan with never a touch of the wilderness. How then?

2. *The nature of temptation.*—To Jesus, at the hour of His baptism in Jordan, there came the definite revelation that He had been chosen as God's Messiah. In this high mood He hurried into the wilderness and there met Satan; and we conclude that the whole assault of Satan, its inmost significance, was to seduce Jesus from that high mood, to lower, somehow, the lights within His soul. Every man who knows anything about the soul knows that every exalted mood, every high sense of life, of its sacredness and responsibility, meets

the devil next moment. So it was with Jesus, who was tempted in all things just as we are—but without sin.

Though we always speak of the first, and second, and third temptation, there was really but one. Just as, with ourselves, in every deep experience, it is *one* thing that is troubling us, *one* thing that is haunting us. So here, Satan chose three different methods, but he had but one object.

(1) *The temptation to a low view of Himself.*—Observe the manner of the first assault. 'If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.' 'If thou be the Son of God.' It was an attempt to raise a question in the soul of Jesus. Satan tried to break the spring of action in our Lord's soul by hinting a doubt. Satan is above all else the seducer, the spirit who slays ideals, who kills enthusiasms in human souls. He is the denier, as God is the Affirmer, within all souls.

What is the doubt he hinted here? It is as though he had said: 'It is well to have high feelings, and the sense of a Divine mission in life, but'—this was the first assault, and every assault on a man's personal ideals begins with that word 'but'—'but it may be, you are deceiving yourself. It may not be God who is inspiring you, who is calling you. You may be mistaken. In any case, are you quite sure? You can soon satisfy yourself.' 'You are hungry. Here are stones. See if they will turn into bread at your word.' But Jesus silenced him and repelled him there. For had He yielded, had He agreed that it was quite fair for one who believes in God to demand at every step some visible sign that God is with him—He would have set what is seen above what is unseen, the outward above the inward, and would have dethroned faith from the soul. For the very quality of faith lies here—that a man shall be obedient to its call, shall trust to his own private inspirations, shall believe they come from God, and shall go forward just as they lead, though circumstances remain hostile and God gives no sign.

Is not this the method of Satan with us still? For the first time we see what God would have us be or do. And with a new light in our eyes, we set out upon our new behaviour. The glow of the experience itself carries us for a certain distance, and then—we meet our Satan. He may be in the form of some friend whom we have not seen for a time, and who does not know what has been happening within us of late. He speaks to us in the old way, he looks at life in our hearing as we used to look at it together. A voice begins to attack us from within. 'Do you not see,' it says, 'that you were setting yourself too high a task. You see how the glow of those fine feelings of yours has already died. If God ever was behind those feelings—which I think you may now question—He has certainly forsaken you now!' He goes on: 'Remember you are only a man, with the appetites, with the weaknesses of a man. Why did God give you these appetites if He did not mean you to yield to them?'

(2) *Temptation to a low view of others.*—Having failed to seduce Jesus by raising doubts in His mind regarding His own commission and high sense of life; having failed to lead Jesus to take a low and cynical view of Himself, the Devil proceeded to suggest to Him a low and cynical view of other men, of the Jewish nation, and of mankind.

It is as though he had said: 'Granted, then, that you are the Son of God, granted that these high emotions of yours are the very breathings of God, what then? Who are they for whom you are going to give up your life? Why should you take the high road, the sublime road, the way of spirituality and of suffering? You can get them on lower terms. Come to terms with men. Fall in with their own worldly ideas. Here are the Jews, for example; they want a Messiah of a certain kind—one who will be their King and free them from Rome. Even at this moment Jews are praying in the courts of the Temple for the Messiah to come down from heaven. Get you, then, to the pinnacle of the Temple; fall down amongst them. They will say that you fell from heaven. They will proclaim you King. You will be supreme in one day and without a moment's pain. Nay, for that matter, lower your demands of men; and if you have the power of God with you, you may have the whole world at your feet—once more without a moment's pain. They have all their price—a small one. Lower your terms, your demand; promise them just what they want—and the world is yours.'[1]

3. *The result of temptation.*—What would life be without temptation? Suppose life demanded no vigilance and no quest and no resistance. Well, then, most assuredly there would be no moral muscle, no heroic fibre, no spiritual grandeur.

In one of the greatest books of the Renaissance,

[1] J. A. Hutton, *Our Only Safeguard*, 148.

although its greatness is not spiritual—in the autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini—there is a moving and exhilarating account of the casting of his masterpiece, the bronze statue of Perseus which fronts the piazza at Florence. How the wood was gathered from the forests; and the clay for the mould was seasoned for months beforehand; and then the furnace was kindled, and the logs took fire, and the heat became overpowering, and the craftsman sent for all his pewter platters and porringers and dishes, to the number of some two hundred pieces, and had them cast into the blaze, till the metal was in perfect liquefaction; and the mould filled beautifully; and, after it had cooled for two days, the statue was uncovered; and it was so complete, so fascinating, so picturesque, so dramatic, that in his astonishment its artificer saw the hand of God arranging and controlling all. It is a parable of why the Holy Spirit sends us to the Wilderness and subjects us to the furnace. We come forth shaped into warriors of the Lord, warriors who are not bronze statues but living and loving men.

'And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit to Galilee,' says St. Luke. The sentence has in it something of the strength and pomp of an army marching back from battle with triumphant banners. He went into the wilderness driven by the Spirit. And now in the power of the Spirit He returns.[1]

[1] J. H. Jowett, in *The Expositor and Current Anecdotes*, xxii. 68.

The Development of Thought within the Fourth Gospel.

By the Reverend R. H. Strachan, D.D., Edinburgh.

I.

The question of the natural and chronological development of the teaching and events within the Synoptic Gospels may be regarded as more or less generally determined in its main outline. Something will be said later regarding the reasonableness of the demand for a complete harmony among the three. There is undoubtedly in the Fourth Gospel a sequence both of thought and of events which at many points directly contradicts the Synoptic sequences and, in my opinion, cannot be reconciled with these.

Before, however, we go on to discuss the nature of the development in the Fourth Gospel, it is necessary to say something about the thought itself, the general attitude of the writer towards Jesus and the events of His life.

One cannot escape the questions that arise in our minds when we compare this Gospel with the Synoptic narratives. Let me mention one or two of the familiar facts.

(1) We have a strikingly different conception of Jesus' *miracles* in this Gospel. The Fourth Evangelist uses a different name for them. The Synoptic writers call them δυνάμεις—'acts of power,' whose motive is compassion. Jesus Himself discourages the idea of laying undue stress on them, and they are wrung from Him, because He cannot bear to withhold the help that is sought. He will never work miracles as mere displays. He exercises His power because He loves men, and in a sense cannot help so doing. They are, in other words, spontaneous. In the Fourth Gospel the miracles are *evidential*. They are called, not δυνάμεις but σημεῖα—'signs,' 'evidences,' 'demonstrations' of His Person, His Divine Nature. Sometimes they are called *works*, and it is interesting to note that the Fourth Evangelist seems to include under 'works' and 'signs' more than those acts we call miraculous. The miracles take their place among the other incidents of Jesus' life as evidences of His Divine Nature and of His Divine Sonship.[1]

[1] The contrast between the two conceptions of miracle has nowhere been more impressively stated than by R. H. Hutton. 'The miraculous power which in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke is mainly the organ of a Divine compassion for human misery and pain, is in this Gospel—primarily at least—the revealing medium of a mighty spiritual presence,

(2) There are also the *Discourses*. They are not longer than some of the utterances in the Synoptics, but the style is different. We must, as has often been pointed out, guard against the idea that in the Synoptics—whether in narrative or in saying—we have the actual event, more or less photographically reproduced, or the actual word that once 'ruffled the air of Palestine'; and that, by contrast, in the Fourth Gospel, we have an interpretation of events, and of sayings. There is no doubt to-day, in the mind of any responsible critic, that the Synoptic discourses and sayings also contain an element of added interpretation. In the Fourth Gospel, however, the feature is much more marked. It is akin, as Dr. Moffatt and others have pointed out, to what happens in the case of the noblest preaching, the result that follows 'when the mind broods upon some fact or saying.' It is also akin to the poet's work, which is not pure invention, but creation. The problem has also an affinity with that created by the prophetic discourses and narratives in the Old Testament. 'Thus saith the Lord' is the prophetic formula, and in the O.T. historical events are so presented as to manifest the Divine action and purpose, and become the material of prophetic history.

In the Gospels, especially in the Fourth, and indeed in the N.T. generally, the formula is, 'Thus saith Jesus'; 'Thus did Jesus'; 'Thus saith the Spirit.' It is all a very significant indication of the place given to Jesus in the earliest Christian consciousness. What we appear to lose in historical accuracy we regain and more in our impression of the reality of the earliest belief as to the person of Jesus. 'We have,' as Paul says, 'the mind of Christ.'

To return to the Discourses in the Fourth Gospel. Sometimes they are monologues, and often controversial dialogues; often, also, descriptions of fierce disputes with opponents. So fierce is the disputation, and so subtle are the points scored against opponents—occasionally by a purely Rabbinical use of Scripture—that it is difficult to conceive that the historical Jesus is speaking. It is true that the Johannine discourses contain many sayings either found in the Synoptics or like those found in the Synoptics, but in them generally there is a reliance on pure dialectic, which is unlike the direct, prophetic character of most of the Synoptic utterances. The so-called mystical element in the Johannine discourses need not present such difficulty in face of such passages as Mt $11^{25ff.}$, as is generally supposed.

(3) There is an absence of that touch with contemporary reality in the time of Jesus, so prominent in the Synoptic Gospels. Where are *the parables*, with their vivid pictures—a woman's single-room house, or a king's feast, or a shepherd and his sheep? The Johannine parables are allegories (*παροιμίαι*). Where are the publicans and sinners? Where are the crowds of sick and suffering laid at His feet? We have the shepherd in the Fourth Gospel, but we miss the toilsome journey of search in the wilderness, the sheep upon the shoulder of the shepherd, and the rejoicing friends and neighbours.

In general we may say that in the Fourth Evangelist's attitude towards the healing activities of Jesus, in his account of His talk, in his pictures of contemporary life, we have displayed a purpose of mind which cannot fairly be described as an attempt to write history in our sense of the word. There is history and often most accurate history in this Gospel, but we feel that the actual history, the actual traditions he uses, are subordinated consciously and deliberately to a purpose of making them reflect the mind of the Church on Jesus' Person. The historical setting in this Gospel really only plays the part of fulcrum to the lever. Thereon the Evangelist finds a place to stand that he may move the world—the Hellenistic world—to a sense of the universal significance of Jesus. He is using a mass of traditional material, partly akin to the Synoptic, partly 'Johannine' in character. He has subjected it to a pressure, which is also being exercised in his own soul by a growing and deepening Christian experience. The pressure sometimes originates new facts, and sometimes moulds the old facts into other shapes.[1]

We miss, however, in the Fourth Gospel that gradual development of events and teaching which is so prominent in the Gospel of Mark. I assume that Mark may be regarded as the chief source from which can be inferred the general order of events in Christ's life; the general development

and intended more as a solemn parting in the clouds of Providence, to enable man to gaze up into the light of Divine mystery, than as a grateful temporary shower of blessing to a parched and blighted earth.'—*Theological Essays*, 178.

[1] Cf. Moffatt, *Literature of the N.T.*, p. 540.

of His teaching; the gradual unfolding of His person, culminating in the great confession at Cæsarea Philippi; the moment of complete unveiling when the Cross is clearly held forth as the divinely necessary end of His career. On the other hand, there is practically no moment in the Fourth Gospel, no utterance of Jesus, in which the idea of the Cross has not a place.

(4) It is obvious that the proportion of space and attention given to the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus affords a complete contrast to the proportion given to the Galilean ministry in the Synoptic Gospels. There is no doubt that the Synoptic tradition needs to be amplified, and that there must have been a longer, and perhaps more frequent ministry in Jerusalem than the Synoptic narrative allows. For example, Judas was a Judean, and the intimacy with Martha and Mary points to frequent visits to Bethany. There is also the anonymous friend of the Upper Room. We have, above all, the lyric lament, 'How often would I have gathered thee!' spoken over a city He knew and loved, which points not to unfulfilled desire, but to baffled effort. The Temptations themselves, as has been significantly pointed out, presuppose a much larger mission of preaching and healing than Galilee is able alone to provide. The vision of 'the kingdoms of the world,' a crowd clamouring for bread, the pinnacle of the Temple, suggests the capital city with all its surging movements, political and religious.

At the same time, granting that the indications of a fuller Jerusalem ministry indirectly supplement the Synoptic narrative, it is, in face of all the facts, impossible to assert that this idea of supplementing the Synoptic writers enters into the direct purpose of the author of the Fourth Gospel. His is another and a different purpose altogether. His aim is not to write a mere narrative, for he is not ultimately responsible for the narrative; rather he makes use of narrative for an ideal purpose. If we take the Fourth Gospel as narrative, in the same sense as the Synoptic Gospels are narrative, we are speedily involved in futile and arbitrary attempts to harmonize its order and detail with those of the Synoptics. Even in the case of the Synoptics, it is a hopeless task to fit all the incidents and sayings in Matthew and Luke into the historical framework of Mark. 'Harmonies of the Gospels' are just *tours de force*, intended to buttress faith, and to rest it on a basis where it can never rest alone. 'If I wished,' says Mr. R. H. Hutton, 'to doubt the possibility of a revelation, I should take a course of reading in defence of it.' This applies in particular to harmonistic treatments of the Gospel narratives, such as we find in many Lives of Jesus. There is and must ever be, for faith, a secure basis of history; but that basis must never be represented as a minimum or a maximum with which historical criticism has provided us. Faith must not be at the mercy of the latest N.T. critic, orthodox or advanced.[1]

Jesus first becomes a historical fact for the Christian consciousness, as distinct from an antiquarian fact, neither in Galilee nor in Judea, but in the Upper Room after the Resurrection, at Pentecost, in Philippi, in Thessalonica. Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians is the earliest known N.T. document, and assumes a historical work of the risen Jesus through the Spirit. *The Lord is the Spirit*, as Paul says with fine historical sense and accuracy. The Spirit is the first manifestation in world-history of the real dynamic of the Christian Faith. Bernard Shaw, in his latest Preface, says that science has never been foolish enough to base the truth of the doctrine of specific gravity on the historical truth of the story that Archimedes, when he first discovered it, fled excited and naked out of his bath into the streets, and cried, εὕρηκα. The Church has not always been so wise. Even for the Gospel writers, the fact that comes last in their order of events, is in their experience the first, the fact of the risen and triumphant Christ.

The Evangelist uses history—as he found it—as a kind of transparent medium which conveys certain aspects of faith and unbelief. This method of writing pictorial history, in the form of 'historical sermons,' was a familiar Jewish method. Large stretches of the O.T. historical books can be interpreted only in this way, *e.g.* the stories of Elijah and Elisha. The method was known as *haggadah*, a homily founded on portions of the sacred history. In one important aspect the Fourth Gospel may be regarded as Christian *haggadah*. It was a process of extracting the spiritual as distinct from

[1] Religion can never be secure on the basis of mere external historical credentials. If it professes to be so, it becomes mere antiquarian research. We may begin with historical evidence, but we must 'hold our trust in God by the same tenure as our trust in man, that of living and growing *personal* impression.'—Hutton, *Theological Essays*, p. 167.

the 'bodily' meaning of a narrative, a process which every homilist to-day adopts. *Haggadah*, however, is not a complete explanation of the thought of this Gospel. 'Poetry,' in Matthew Arnold's words, 'attaches its emotion to the idea: the idea is the fact. The strongest part of our religion to-day is its unconscious poetry.' There is much more than *haggadah* in the Fourth Gospel. There is that universal kind of religious imagination which is the expression of Christian experience in its relation to the facts that lie behind the Gospels; that unchanging dramatic interpretation of scenes and persons whereby the speaker or worshipper is enabled to speak or to think as though he himself were one of the actors in the scene.

'Love always has a swift and powerful dramatic tendency; and some men whose religious love has been at once profound and transfiguring, have seen the atonement as a constant moving tragedy of sacrifice in which they themselves, with the egoism of supreme humility, have taken a privileged, if supernumerary part. Around the central figure they see ranged all the world, in a vast cirque of multitudinous human experience, and themselves present foremost in the crowd acclaiming or reviling. Except with themselves dramatically present, except in the light of this pious egoism, they do not and could not realize His life and death.'[1]

A similar imaginative process has been at work in the Fourth Gospel. The process has been at work all through, but no one can read the writer's dramatic presentations, especially of the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus, without feeling that they are written by one who has taken part in these scenes more closely and more really than even an actual eye-witness who stood too near the events could do. He has entered more fully into the psychology of Peter's denial than any of the other three evangelists. He shrinks in horror from Judas' deed, vividly depicts the irony of the condemnation by Caiaphas, and realizes the pitiableness of Pilate's moral vacillation to a degree shared by none of the other evangelists. He has, indeed, been there, and has said, 'Lord, is it I?'

This Gospel represents the classical attempt to present a portrait of Jesus—the real historical Jesus—in His activity both pre-Resurrection and post-Resurrection, which shall be adequate as an object of faith to a world that is far wider in its horizon, far older in its intellectual outlook and environment, than the Jewish world. It is the Hellenistic world, which includes not only Judaism, but Grecian and Roman thought, and into which there has been poured a mingled stream of Oriental religious thought, mystery-cults, and others. Is Christianity a Jewish sect, or is it a world-religion? Is Jesus the 'Word,' the 'Logos,' the answer to the questionings which the great world-process, the 'Nature' of the Stoic, the 'Evolution' of to-day, makes to arise in men's minds? We might almost say that the Fourth Evangelist is the great 'modernist' of his day, and a type for all modernists; for he is also a missionary, not of intellectual ideas merely, but of the good news of a Christ great enough for the ever-expanding needs — moral, intellectual, and spiritual—of humanity.

It needs also to be reiterated that the Fourth Evangelist's work is the crown and completion of the missionary and theological activity of Paul. The intellectual background of Paul's preaching is a presentation of the risen Jesus, whose work is represented as a great spiritual Drama enacted in the Universe. Jesus has vanquished the hostile spiritual powers, 'principalities and powers.' They are the 'forces,' as we would call them, in life, that make men afraid, or lead them astray. Sin, Pain, and Death are personified. These 'powers' are sometimes incarnate in hostile human personalities; sometimes they act like thunder-bolts from a clear sky, hindering and thwarting the human heart, and robbing us of what is dear—'hunger, famine, pestilence, sword.' Men are 'dying daily,' expending faith and strength, sacrifice and moral effort—is it in vain? In the Cross of Christ, Paul saw, as in spiritual vision, God and 'Satanism' in mortal combat. 'Satanism' slew 'the Lord of glory' and God 'highly exalted him, and gave him a name above every name.' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself.' Paul's 'good news' was that men, who were in such bondage of fear, might now walk with a new spirit of hope, confidence, and moral victory in their hearts. Their hearts were eternally at rest; for they could say 'Abba, Father.' The lover's sweet dynamic of carelessness, and freedom, and cleansing was in their hearts—'The Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.' And the crowning wonder was that in that vast terrifying universe God had taken the first step.

Paul was dead, and the communities he had founded remained. The immediate touch with

[1] John Freeman, *Essay on Maeterlinck*, 'The Moderns,' p. 162.

the historical Jesus was being lost. It was the beginning of the second century. Persecution and the years were thinning the ranks of the earliest disciples. Even believers were beginning to ask, 'Where is the promise of His coming?'

'What shall we say in answer to those who in the name of Judaism assert that Paul and his Master too, were mere iconoclasts, mere Sabbath-breakers, mere freaks of history? What shall we say in answer to those who see in our Eucharist another pagan custom or secret rite, or to those sacramentarians among us who give such an impression?[1] What shall we say to those who see in our Lord a criminal condemned not only by a Jewish court, but by a Roman tribunal? What shall we say to the Stoic who sees in Gethsemane only a moral breakdown, and a pitiful exhibition of weakness? What shall we say to sneers, like the later sneer of Celsus, that 'no good general was ever betrayed'?[2]

Space forbids the further development of this line of thought. It is sufficient to say that the environment of the Fourth Gospel in the beginning of the second century A.D. will require much more attention, if we are ever to understand why just such ideas and such incidents as it contains were chosen.

[1] 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (6[52]).

[2] Moffatt, *Literature of the N.T.*, p. 530, note.

Contributions and Comments.

Gideon and his Three Hundred (Judg. vii. 5, 6).

In the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES Professor Gautier of Geneva takes exception to the statement made in the April number that these verses are quite in order and that no emendations are required; and he refers to a discussion of this story in Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*—a reference for which many will thank him. The best defence of the above statement will be a literal translation of the verses, taking the verb *kara'* in what is no doubt its primitive sense of 'to drink like a horse by putting the mouth in the water.' The verses run: 'So he led the people down to the water, and the Lord said to Gideon, Every man who laps of the water with his tongue, as a dog laps, you will set by himself, and every man who goes down on his knees and puts his mouth in the water in drinking. Now the number of those who lapped, putting their hands to their mouths, was three hundred, and all the rest of the people went down on their knees and put their mouths in the water in drinking water.' The last phrase is a little inelegant in English owing to the repetition of the word 'water.'

Now this is exactly the sense given by Frazer in the passage referred to by Dr. Gautier, only that he renders the verb *kara'* by the English verb 'to suck,' which is, of course, what a horse does.

In Hebrew this primitive sense of the verb *kara'* seems to be obsolete, but it still retains the meaning of going down on the knees and putting the mouth *in the dust*, as Sindbad the Sailor was in the habit of doing, and as Mordecai was expected to do (Est 3[2. 5]). As the word is found under forty times in the Hebrew Bible, perhaps the wonder is to find it even once in its primitive sense.

Professor Gautier also objects to the statement that the Hebrew word for 'water' implies rain-water, but the reference was to the word *kara'*. Perhaps it would have been better to say 'suggests' rather than 'implies.'

May I venture one step further? It would be difficult to exaggerate our ignorance of classical Hebrew. Of its rhetoric, metaphors, allusions, and figures of speech we know nothing. To this ignorance is no doubt due the very large number of verses in the Hebrew Bible of which we can make nothing. The present seems to be a pretty clear case where a result of criticism is really due to our ignorance of the language. Much else is no doubt due to the same cause. Even in Arabic, with all the aid of native grammarians, the most famous European scholars make slips. The best horse stumbles sometimes. But in regard to Hebrew, for the European to attempt criticism is to hunt the fox without a scent.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow University.

The Unnamed Companion of Cleopas.

THE Gospels present us with many important questions of personal identity, their importance being mainly due to the practical issues which wait upon critical investigation and decision. Among the most interesting and perplexing of this class of question is that concerning the unnamed companion of Cleopas in the Emmæus story of Lk 24^{13-35}. It has puzzled exegetes and scholars for many generations. Why is only one named of the two? What significance attaches to the one name mentioned which could account for its insertion in the narrative? Would the name of Cleopas have any importance that could suggest a reason for referring to him specially? If Cleopas is mentioned nowhere else in the Gospels, can the retention of his name here be of any value? These are some of the obvious questions which set us even more eagerly in search for the identity of his unnamed companion. We may possibly discover that the name of Cleopas furnishes a clue as to 'that other one,' and that the unnamed disciple may be identified by piecing together the internal data. By the simple process of exhausting the theories which have been advanced, we may arrive at a satisfactory starting-point for our inquiry.

1. That this unnamed disciple was not St. Luke himself, is clear from the fact that he implicitly affirms (Lk 1^{2}) that his Gospel had been delivered to him by eye-witnesses of the resurrection, and that he had not himself seen the risen Lord. (*Vide* Archbishop Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, chapter on 'The Walk to Emmæus.')

2. Jerome declared that they both may have been of the Seventy, but Trench cautiously remarks, 'We cannot affirm it with any certainty.'

3. Dr. David Smith refers to other conjectures (*The Days of His Flesh*, footnote on p. 511), such as Origen's theory that it was Simon, and Epiphanius' notion that it was Nathanael.

But these, and many others that are similar, lack trustworthy proofs, and our only hope of a reasonable solution is in pressing our inquiry back patiently and critically to a re-examination of internal evidences. And here we find ourselves faced with a linguistic problem. The only similarity to the name Cleopas in Lk 24^{18} is that of Clopas in Jn 19^{25}, and although N.T. scholars have repeatedly warned us against identifying the two names as representing one and the same man, it must not be assumed that the matter is closed, or that the warning suggests solid and unmovable difficulties. A sound and wise critical attitude towards the Bible documents forbids unalterable conclusions upon questions relating to text. And this is entirely a question of text—that is to say, of language.

Two very pertinent articles in Hastings' DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE—one on 'Alphæus' (vol. i. pp. 74, 75) and one on 'The Brethren of the Lord' (vol. i. p. 320)—throw considerable light upon the identity of Cleopas. It is quite evident that some N.T. scholars of repute have decided that Cleopas of Lk 24^{18} and Clopas of Jn 19^{25} are identical. Ewald assumes this. So also do Meyer, Alford, and Lightfoot. Controversy has waged around the identification of Cleopas and Clopas with Alphæus, the two Greek names being regarded as a simple transliteration of the Aramaic Halphai. Is then the difference between Luke's use of the word Κλεόπας and John's use of the word Κλωπᾶς to be accounted for by the different linguistic origins of the two Gospels?

Dr. A. B. Bruce in his Introduction to St. Luke's Gospel (*Expositor's Greek Test.*) says that 'the literary aspect of this Gospel is a complex phenomenon. At times . . . one gets the impression of a writer having at his command a knowledge of Greek possible only for one to whom it was his native tongue, an expert at once in the vocabulary and the grammatical structure of that language. But far oftener the impression is that of a Jew thinking in Hebrew and reflecting the Hebrew idiom in phrase and construction.' If that finding is accurate there is no difficulty in accepting the Hebrew-Greek origin of Luke's Κλεόπας.

In regard to the Fourth Gospel there has recently been published a fresh contribution to the baffling problem of its linguistic origin. Dr. C. F. Burney, the eminent Oxford Semitist, has just issued a notable volume on *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. By a critical examination of the differentiating constructions which are characteristically Hebraic and those which are definitely Aramaic he shows that whereas Luke's style is Greek often modelled upon the Hebraic Greek of the LXX, John's, on the other hand, is so entirely

Aramaic, that we must presuppose an original Aramaic Gospel which has been translated with unidiomatic fidelity into Greek. This ingenious theory, differing as it does from the verdict of Deissmann and Wellhausen, and from Dr. Rendel Harris's characteristically original and illuminating contribution on the Greek origin of the Logos doctrine of the prologue of the Fourth Gospel (vide *The Expositor*, Sept. 1920), is not only revolutionary in current Johannine criticism, but calls for a re-examination of the linguistic data of all the Gospels.

In the light of this discussion we may assume that the Hebraic-Greek form of Κλεόπας in Luke is only a variant of the Aramaic-Greek Κλωπᾶς of John, and that in fact the two words actually represent one and the same man. Now this is exceedingly important as furnishing a clue to the unnamed companion of Cleopas.

The reference to Cleopas in Jn 19^{25} is as the husband of Mary, one of the four women who, John tells us, 'stood by the cross of Jesus.' Luke prefaces the Emmæus story by a reference to the women who were with those who visited the sepulchre, 'and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles' (Lk $24^{9, 10}$). Among 'the other women' we may justly include the 'Mary of Cleopas.' So it is clear that she stood by the cross, and had seen the empty sepulchre. She was as deeply convinced of the resurrection as of the crucifixion. And the empty sepulchre had proved to the women that Jesus was alive. With the swift intuition of womanhood where love is concerned, they were persuaded of the resurrection, and hurried to tell 'all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest' (Lk 24^{9}). 'All the rest' included the Seventy, and all other of Christ's disciples, and among them was Cleopas. 'And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.'

Cleopas did not believe. The crucifixion shattered his hopes, as it had shattered the hopes of others. So he turns back home again, a disappointed and dejected man. And it is a quite natural inference that Mary, his wife, accompanied him. With her radiant conviction that the Lord was risen she would seek to lift the cloud of his despondency and doubt. They took the road home together, and the fading light of sunset and the shadows along the dusty country road were a fit setting for the interplay of hope and doubt that mingled in their conversation as 'they talked together of all these things which had happened.' 'From more than one word in the conversation, we may take it for granted that these two were in earnest debate; not unduly striving nor contending, but still regarding from different points of view, and each urging upon the other a different interpretation of that stupendous event.'

It is evident from Luke's narrative that they were of diverse temperaments, 'Cleopas being inclined to despond, whereas his companion was of a sanguine turn, and a somewhat heated controversy arose between them. In the midst of it a stranger joined them. He accosted them, saying, 'What are these arguments which ye are bandying one with another as ye walk?' Ashamed that their quarrel had been overheard, they stood with downcast faces (v.[17], καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί). The gloomy Cleopas answered, not without petulance, perhaps resenting the intrusion, 'Art thou sojourning all alone in Jerusalem, that thou knowest not the things that have been done therein during these days?' 'And,' sighed Cleopas, 'we were hoping that it was He that should redeem Israel, but to crown all, this is the third day since these things were done!' 'Yes,' broke in the other, more hopefully, 'and some women of our company . . . said they had also seen a vision of angels which said that He was alive!' 'But,' retorted the unbelieving Cleopas, 'they did not see Him!' (David Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, p. 511 *et seq.*)

Then came the Master's lesson from the Scriptures, their arrival at the Emmæus home, the acceptance of hospitality, the startling disclosure to the now eager man and wife, and the sacramental uplift of the evening meal. If it be a fact that, after all, the unnamed companion of Cleopas was his own wife, we can understand why, in deference to Oriental custom, the man's name only is mentioned, and we can put the graphic story alongside of other incidents in the Scriptures which show us how believing women have helped their doubting husbands into 'the full assurance of faith.'

C. Evelyn Charlesworth.
Bristol.

'I buffet my Body.'

Is not Mr. Fotheringham straining the text somewhat in his explanation—in the December issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—of the above passage? The word ὑπωπιάζω certainly means, 'I beat black and blue,' but in its literal sense it suggests the black eye given in boxing (ὑπό + ὤψ), an interpretation which hardly fits in with what he calls 'the wholesome discipline of the scourge.'

The word occurs again in Lk 18[5]. Perhaps there also we ought to understand that the judge fears that the widow will one day belabour him with the 'wholesome discipline of the scourge'! The explanation of Protestant commentators surely gives better sense. H. R. MOXLEY.

The Parsonage,
St. Mary Cray.

'A Great High Priest' (Hebrews iv. 14).

THE Apostle uses here a very unusual combination of predicates to describe the office of our Lord. It is found nowhere else. Even the term ἀρχιερεύς is never used by the Septuagint. In the earlier books of the Bible it always translates the Hebrew הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל by ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας. In the later books, where the Hebrew is כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ, it translates either ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας or ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ πρῶτος. Why then this unusual combination? It is not enough to say that the Apostle wished by the predicate μέγας to point out the greatness of Christ in comparison with the other high priests. He does this right throughout the Epistle. But it is only in connexion with the Ascension of our Lord that he uses this uncommon combination, and therefore presumably with a definite purpose.

With the late Dr. Biesenthal (whose views in his almost unknown Commentary I adopt and also somewhat enlarge), I believe that the Apostle used this combination deliberately and with a definite purpose, (1) because of the peculiar circumstances of the time, and (2) to accentuate the unchangeable and eternal High Priesthood of our Lord.

Seemingly the predicate גָּדוֹל = μέγας was originally applied only to the virtually acting high priest. Later the term רֹאשׁ took the place of גָּדוֹל. But towards the end of the Second Temple, when political power influenced the choice of high priests and the office was often sold to the highest bidder and almost changed annually, and the number of deposed or ex-high priests became large (no fewer than 26 are enumerated from the days of Herod to the destruction of the Temple), the title גָּדוֹל was left for the use of the deposed high priests, who also occasionally and as a matter of courtesy exercised certain functions; while for the acting high priest the title of כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ was used. Hence while there were times when there was a large number of ἀρχιερεῖς, which confirms the accuracy of the New Testament writers in often speaking of 'high priests,' there was always only one official 'Cohen-ha-Rosh' = כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ.

This being the case, one can at once see the reason why the Apostle uses the two predicates. He declares thereby, first, that, as Christ is 'Priest for ever' (Ps 110[4]), the title of כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל belongs to Him *eo ipso* and He can never be deprived of it. Secondly, as He is the ever-acting High Priest in Heaven, and yet the ever-present with the company of the Faithful, He is also the כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ. No mortal can combine with His name these two titles; they belong exclusively to 'Jesus the Son of God.' By this unusual combination, which has seemingly escaped the notice of commentators, but must have been very suggestive to the Hebrew-Christians to whom the Epistle was addressed, the Apostle not only points out the greatness, but the eternal Priesthood of our risen and ascended Lord.

This view proves at the same time the historical accuracy of St. Luke 3[2], where commentators puzzled about 'Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests,' and also refutes the assertion in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, that 'John made a curious error (11[49] 18[13]) in speaking of Caiaphas as high priest "in that year," as if he interchanged every year with Annas.' St. John made no error; he stated a fact which he was specially cognizant of, as 'he was known unto the high priest,' and perhaps was even related to the family. Caiaphas was the *acting* high priest 'that same year,' that fateful year to the troubled fortunes of Israel. Annas had held the office a little while before under Quirinius, just as his three sons became high priests a little while afterwards, and undoubtedly, though deposed, was a man of great influence. It would perhaps be as well if modern critics were not quite so ready to

charge the Evangelists with ignorance or historical inaccuracy of events they must have been familiar with.

It is noteworthy that the late Professor Delitzsch, in his Hebrew Version, translated the ἀρχιερεύς of Jn 11[44] by כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ and He 4[14] by כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ גָּדוֹל, thus only differing from Dr. Biesenthal in not using the article with the word רֹאשׁ. One wonders why in 18[18] he uses the Rabbinic and redundant אֲשֶׁר שִׁמֵּשׁ בִּכְהוּנָּה גְּדוֹלָה, 'who served in the high priesthood,' for exactly the same Greek word.

C. P. Sherman.

Hexham.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PEACE.

To Dr. Hastings' series on 'The Great Christian Doctrines' has now been added a volume on *The Christian Doctrine of Peace* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net). It has all the special features of the earlier volumes, which dealt with the doctrines of Prayer and Faith.

The subject of this latest volume is very prominent in men's minds at the present time, for to-day we are turning afresh to the ideal of universal peace. As Principal A. E. Garvie said recently, 'The Christian ideal of world-peace has to-day an authority and influence which it never had before.' Long before the Genoa and Copenhagen Conferences were held, Dr. Hastings had, as he stated in the November issue of The Expository Times, prepared this volume, the final proofs of which were passed shortly before his death. In the Introduction he outlined the scope of this work which he hoped would be used as the basis of discourse when peace was preached, as he saw it must be 'before everything else.' 'Peace is peace with God, peace with self, peace with other men. And peace with men includes peace with nations. Thus the doctrine of peace is the doctrine of war, and we have to consider from the Christian point of view the use of force, Christ's teaching on non-resistance, and the whole subject of the necessity of war, its advantages and disadvantages, and the prospect of its passing away for ever.'

The contents of the volume include the introduction and sixteen chapters. The subject-headings of some of these chapters are: 'The God of Peace,' 'The Peace of Christ,' 'Peace with God,' and 'Peace of Conscience.' The chapter on 'The Sermon on the Mount' is specially important. The subject is dealt with under three heads, 'Its Hearers,' 'Its Method,' and 'Its Aim.' This is followed by chapters on 'The Use of Force,' 'War,' 'The Good of War,' 'The Evil of War,' 'The End of War,' concluding with 'What are We to Do?' Every chapter is prefaced by a very full list of literature.

Dr. Hastings' conclusion as to the prospect of war passing away for ever may be summed up in the verses of John Addington Symonds which he quotes.

> These things shall be: a loftier race
> Than ere the world hath known shall rise,
> With flame of freedom in their souls
> And light of knowledge in their eyes.
>
> They shall be gentle, brave, and strong
> To spill no drop of blood, but dare
> All that may plant man's lordship firm
> On earth, and fire, and sea, and air.
>
> Nation with nation, land with land,
> Unarmed shall live as comrades free;
> In every heart and brain shall throb
> The pulse of one fraternity.

SOME TOPICS.

Our Ambiguous Life.

'In a most pathetic passage in Plato we are told that in face of the great darkness and mysteriousness which are round about us in this world, there is nothing for a man to do except to take the best advice he can get as to how to live, and then take his chance—like a man crossing the lonely sea upon a raft; "unless," he concludes, "we can find some vessel more safe and solid, some word of God on which we may make this passage more securely."

It was into such a twilight and ambiguity that the Lord Jesus Christ came. And still there is no victory over this world, no light upon its final mysteriousness, no support for our apparent insignificance face to face with an overwhelming and regardless universe; no rock on which to plant our feet 'mid the ebb and flow of mood and feeling, of doubt and hope and doubt again, except by a humble and tenacious faith which we allow day by day to recall us and to sustain us, that the Eternal God is our Refuge and underneath are the Everlasting Arms.' This is from the first address in Dr. J. A. Hutton's latest volume, *Our Ambiguous Life* (James Clarke; 6s. net). It explains Dr. Hutton's title and gives the underlying thought of the short addresses. These are sure to be widely read, for Dr. Hutton is a preacher who makes a powerful appeal to the modern mind.

Politics in the Pulpit.

Miss Royden is too closely in touch with the mind of her congregation not to know that some annoyance might be felt, even if it were not expressed, at a political sermon. And so she told the members why she intended occasionally to treat political issues in the pulpit—the politics of the day, that is. For they would welcome a sermon, she knew, from the words of an Old Testament prophet, forgetting that to the people who heard them they seemed in their time tactlessly political. Nor is Miss Royden content to treat distant issues that are not likely to irritate. 'The other day,' she said, 'I was at a missionary meeting where the missionary told us about his work in India. He said, "These people, if you will believe it, many of them do not own a yard of land in the great country which belongs to them. They do not even own the house they live in. Many of them are in debt. They cannot get money. They cannot get on. They never seem to have a chance. So we set to work to try and alter these conditions." All the audience burst into a thunder of applause, and I held my head and thought to myself: "Is he describing India, or is he describing England?" There was extraordinarily little difference between his description of India and England, but because India is so far away, every one saw how right it was that the Church of Christ should be concerned with men's bodies as well as their souls and should care when people suffer, not only to bind up their wounds, but to get rid of the cause of the trouble.'

Miss Royden's reason for occasionally preaching political sermons is that she believes that there is no question to which Christ's laws do not apply, and that there are times not only for the declaration of principles, but for their application to particular issues. 'How proud,' she says, 'those of us who belong to any Christian Church would be, if we could have claimed that it had always spoken for those who could not speak for themselves! If a Wilberforce, or a Lord Shaftesbury had not been left to fight his battle almost alone; if a Mrs. Josephine Butler had not been cast out by nearly all the people who called themselves respectable.'

Miss Royden knows that in every political question where a moral issue is involved good Christian people are found on both sides. They were found on both sides of the slavery struggle, but one side was wrong. She recognizes that she has a duty to inform her mind to the utmost of her ability, and then, not hindered by the fear of hurting people's feelings, to preach with directness the truth as she sees it.

What of the starving children of Austria? Should a preacher confine himself to appeals for money for them—a political question no doubt, but not involving disturbing criticism of foreign policy. 'What would you think?' asks Miss Royden, 'if year after year you pour your money into Vienna, and year after year I come to you with the same story, and say: "These children are still starving." And you will say at last: "Why, we have given all this money! Why are they still in the same state?" And I say, "Because the terms of the peace that was imposed on Austria have made it impossible for Austria to recover."

'Would not you have a right to say to me at last: "Why did you not say at the beginning all this?"'

Miss Royden has preached on our Irish policy, on Disarmament, on the Care of the Insane, and many other political topics—political in the broad sense of the word. These sermons have now been collected and published by Messrs. Putnams under the title *Political Christianity* (3s. 6d. net).

Divorce.

In Mt 5^{32} Jesus faces the burning question of divorce, and here His word is unmistakably clear. It is possible that even the clause which has been

interpreted as conveying an exception should read 'notwithstanding the word' (in Dt 24[1]) 'about misconduct before marriage.' But it should be observed that He is here speaking of marriage between disciples; a large proportion of the marriages now 'solemnized'—to use what is perhaps an unhappy expression—in Christian Churches are not Christian in any recognizable sense of the word; it is exceedingly questionable whether we have any right to say in such cases, 'Whom God hath joined, let not man put asunder,' and we should not seek to impose a law meant to apply to Christian marriage in a contract in which the only power which can make the marriage permanent has never, so far as we can tell, had a place. The honest thing for the Church to do is, I believe, to refuse to be a party to marriages except between her members, or those at least who are prepared to make an open profession of faith, and then to insist that the contract so entered into is not dissoluble by the default of either party. By so doing we should lose much popularity, but we should gain in self-respect, and—what is more important—we should be in line with the teaching of Jesus in regard to this most difficult of all questions.[1]

Meekness.

The word 'meek' is specially difficult to render in modern speech, for it has a wealth of meaning. In the Old Testament it seems to mean 'humble'; in the New it is applied to Himself by Jesus in close connexion with another phrase translated in our versions 'lowly in heart,' but perhaps more adequately rendered 'of homely mind,' 'easy to get on with.' In the Bible, when two epithets are joined by 'and,' it will be found very often that each explains the other. 'Unassuming' or 'ready to make allowances' gives us one side of the meaning of the word, 'patiently persistent' the other. It should be noticed that they are 'to inherit the earth'; that is, to fall heirs to the lordship of human life. They are men, who, with great ends in view, are willing to give way and make allowances in matters of smaller moment; they have that rare faculty, the ability to distinguish trifles from what is of serious importance. All quarrelsome people justify themselves on the ground that the thing is a question of principle with them; the meek man knows by instinct where he must fight and where he can safely yield ground. It may be claimed that 'meekness' in this sense of the word has proved the secret of such success as we have had as an imperial power, as it certainly helped the Roman Empire to hold the nations of the world together for so many centuries. Where we have known how to give way, as in South Africa, we have built up our Empire; where we have been unyielding, as in the war with our American colonies in the eighteenth century, and in so much of our dealings with Ireland in this, we have failed disastrously.[2]

[1] J. A. Findlay, *The Realism of Jesus*, 88.

The Ministry and Women.

The Rev. J. A. Craigie, the Vicar of Montacute, Somerset, has published a volume of topical sermons with the title *Our Heavenly Inheritance* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). The range of subjects is wide—from 'Jesus Christ and Modernism,' which is the first sermon in the volume, to 'The Weather,' which is the last. In all his sermons Mr. Craigie aims, as he tells us in the Preface, at great plainness of speech. This is, perhaps, best seen in his discussion on the 'Ministry and Women.' His position, which we are not concerned to criticise, is that the ministry is no place for women. The reasoning, however, by which he arrives at his conclusion is interesting. Or did he perhaps start with the conclusion and find the reasons afterwards?

The first difficulty about the admission of women to the priesthood is a practical one. No bishops could be found ready to ordain women. 'If they did so they would quickly be deprived of their sees, and the women whom they had ordained could not be recognised by the Catholic Church as holding any ministerial office. And, again, the matter is not one to be settled by a handful of bishops, however right they might seem in their own eyes. The matter is one which would have to be settled by the authority of the whole Catholic Church, or at any rate by a universal or œcumenical council of that branch of the Catholic Church in which the question might arise.'

Mr. Craigie's second difficulty is that the mere suggestion that women should be admitted to take upon themselves the duties and functions of the priesthood wakes within men 'an instinctive horror and revulsion.' He admits that many other things which are now looked upon as quite suitable for women to-day at first appeared shocking, but he adds

[2] J. A. Findlay, *The Realism of Jesus*, 67 f.

that 'the priesthood is not to be mentioned or classed with these in any way. It is beyond all comparison.'

His final argument for the exclusion of women, not only from the priesthood but also from the position of deaconess, is that the silence of Christ with regard to it points to the fact that the ordination of women is contrary to His will. This is how Mr. Craigie sums it up himself. 'I think we cannot but be right when all is said and done, if we adhere to the distinction of sex which has ever obtained in the Church of Christ in regard to its ministry. The old way here, the beaten track, the old paths, seem to have been laid down by Christ once for all, and they are not open to innovations. We must reverently hesitate to tamper with anything which He left seemingly complete and unalterable.' What would Mr. Craigie's attitude have been towards slavery? 'With the cleverest arguments in the world,' Mr. Craigie goes on, 'we are still without His direct sanction to make a change. Let it suffice to go on in the old way; and if we desire the ministrations of women in the Church (as indeed we do), let them be in that direction in which there can be no possible doubt or question. Then no harm can come or outrage be perpetrated.'

Two Things Religion does.

'In the first place, the religion I am thinking of brings all our perplexities to a focus; lifts them up on high; concentrates them on two or three burning points, and shows us with a clearness that admits of no mistaking what a tremendous mystery we are up against in life.

That is the first thing that a true religion does. But if it did that only, it would do us no good but harm, for it would overwhelm us. So it does the second. While, on the one hand, it reveals to us, as I have said, the deep and amazing mystery of our existence, on the other it reveals something yet deeper and more amazing in ourselves, something divine in every one of us, which is more than a match for what it has to face. A true religion does both things, does them together, in the same moment, in the same act.' [1]

NEW POETRY.

John Drinkwater.

Mr. Drinkwater goes on from strength to strength. In *Preludes, 1921–1922* (Sidgwick; 3s. 6d. net), he has given us the finest work he has yet done.

[1] W. L. P. Jacks, *Religious Perplexities*.

The subject of the book is love:

What love is; how I love; how builders' clay
By love is lit into a golden spending;
How love calls beautiful ghosts back to the day;
How life because of love shall have no ending—
These with the dawn I have begun to sing . . .

And Mr. Drinkwater presents his subject in four of its many aspects.

First he retells the story of David and Jonathan, the love of perfect sympathy and understanding between man and man. Then he takes another familiar Bible narrative. 'The Maid of Naaman's Wife,' and shows the love that has its ground in pity. This is half the book and, for us, the most convincing part and the most valuable. Take this descriptive passage. Look at the colour of the picture of the stripling David facing the Philistine. Listen to the music of the lines:

And David stept out of the emerald light
That played up from the grass floor of the tent,
Into the full flood of the April noon,
And walked a little way, and those two stood
Parted a hundred paces, the man of terror,
Hewn massy and with shock of builded limbs,
And David moulded like a sea boy risen
From caves of music where the water spins
Wet sand into the shapes of flowing flowers;
David with limbs all bright with the sun's tones,
And ruddy locks curling with youth and light,
His body all alert on steady loins,
Clean spun of flesh that knew the winter snows,
And mellow pools of summer, and the dews
Dropping among the crocuses of dawn.
His sandal-straps bound ankles as a girl's,
And fluttering to his knees the sheepskin hung,
Cloaking one shoulder, while the other gleamed.
And there he paused, the sling in his right hand,
His left hand fingering the pouch of pebbles,
While Israel fearing murmured, and the hosts
Of Philistine derision rocked the noon.
Then did Goliath cry, 'Am I a dog,
For a boy's whipping? Have you not a man,
That you would send a cleaner up of crumbs
From the queen's table? Come then, and be broken,
For birds to find you and the dogs at night.'
And Jonathan heard Philistia shout again,

And David, like a flame unwinded, stood
Quivering at the cry, and laid a stone
In the sling's fold, and cast his staff, and ran,
Fleet as the king bird gliding under leaves,
Towards Goliath. And a giant spear
Swung from the Philistine hand, and forty paces
Sang in the air and brushed the flying sheepskin,
And sudden David's feet were planted firm,
Locked on the earth, and circling in the sun
The tight thong flashed and loosened, and the stone
Smote the Philistine wrath above the eyes,
And the day was clouded from him, and he fell.

In the second half of the book Mr. Drinkwater turns from the Bible narratives to give us the story of two modern lovers. A Sussex farmer, Lake Winter, falls in love with his neighbour's wife, Zell Dane. The attraction is, at the outset, an intellectual one, but the physical element asserts itself, and their story ends in tragedy. Finally in the poem 'Burning Bush' we have nature, love, and human love blended and mutually interpretative. These blank verse poems form the bulk of the volume, but there are, in addition, several delightful lyrics.

Bernard Raymund.

The Yale University Press are issuing a series of small volumes of poetry with the name of 'The Yale Series.' The object of the series is to bring to the notice of the public the work of the younger American men and women who have not yet secured recognition. The most recent volume in the series is *Hidden Waters*, by Bernard Raymund (Milford: Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net). Mr. Raymund's poems are not equal, but there is a delicate charm about most of them. 'The Dark Pool' is a good example of his descriptive work:

I know a pool where laughter never was,
No bird spread dripping feathers to the sun,
And no flower stood on tiptoe in the grass
To wonder at itself. The minnows run
From stone to stone, unbodied, shadowless;
And water-striders thread their secret way
Under gnarled, ancient roots and tangled cress.
I know a pool that on the windiest day
From bank to bank will not a ruffle show,
And never a willow leaf put out its sail
To find if all the wonders could be so
It gathered from the old tree's misty tale.
But all tired waters pause in that cool deep
To dream of other, farther pools and sleep.

The second poem of Mr. Raymund's which we quote is hardly characteristic, but it is good for our purpose. It is on prayer and growth, and he calls it 'Homiletic':

If it were so
That things pray as they grow,
It seems to me
In the wild rye that overtops the wheat
There were more piety.
And yellow clover growing in a ditch
God's nose must find
More to its liking than the red-top's rich
Smug acreage. I'm of that mind
Myself, and sure I do not know
That I should think it strange—if it were so!

Oxford Poetry.

Oxford Poetry, 1922 (Oxford: Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net), contains examples of the verse of twenty Oxford men. Some of the names we already know. But we have no poem from Mr. Blackwell himself this year, and we miss it. Mr. Force Stead's verse runs smoothly, and we quote his 'Oblivion'—a poem which he addresses to Alan Porter. Mr. Porter has one poem in the collection.

As if the dead had sought to reach
Us through the names they used to know,
They carved these rain-bleared stones to teach
What men were they, laid here a-row:
But now hath time twice marred their speech,
The stones are dumb as they below.

Yet I surmise they rose at break
Of dawn, and trudged afield, and then
Laboured with ox and ass to take
Bread for the hungry world of men,
Sweating at plough and spade and rake
Till dusk, for threescore years and ten.

Ever they rose at brink of day,
Yet drank they once the joy of morn?—
Life from them turned its mind away,
They were not even thought forlorn:

Falstaff can never die,—but they,
Nay, tell me,—were they ever born?

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The University of Edinburgh paid a very high compliment to one of its former professors when it asked Dr. Pringle-Pattison to deliver the Gifford Lectures under its auspices. Professor Pringle-Pattison had already been Gifford lecturer at Aberdeen, and his lectures there, published under the title 'The Idea of God,' have obtained wide recognition and appreciation. For his course at Edinburgh he chose the more restricted subject of the 'Future Life,' and the first series has just appeared—*The Idea of Immortality* (Clarendon Press; 12s. 6d. net).

It is a fascinating book, written with distinction and with a clearness of style and thought that makes the reading a continual pleasure. It is not a difficult book to read, and yet it never fails to make demand on the reader for attention and judgment. It is obvious not only that the writer has thought deeply on his theme (that we should expect), but that he has explored widely and thoroughly the literature of the subject. As a proof of this it may be said that his pages on the Hebrew belief are correct and even illuminating.

What are his own conclusions on this great question? He reviews three arguments for a future life, which may be called the metaphysical, the moral, and the theological. The first of these, the metaphysical, is based on the nature of the soul. From the earliest times and by some of the greatest minds it has been held that the soul is a substantial entity within the body, eternal in its nature, divinely created, and inhabiting the body for only a period.

Professor Pringle-Pattison rejects this view of the soul, almost with scorn. 'People talk as if the being of a soul were something which almost defied annihilation. . . . But surely it is quite the other way.' The soul is just the true self that comes into being as the result of continuous effort. It is the coherent mind and character which is the result of the discipline of time, not some substantial unit or identical subject present in the body all along. It 'achieves a unity and identity,' however, as a self, and 'attains individuality and independence in an ultimate sense.' This does not seem very different from the idea of the soul as a substantial unit; but let that pass.

The writer's own conclusion at this point is the important thing. 'Is it, then, unreasonable to conclude that an individuality so real, and the goal apparently of an age-long process, must be capable of surviving the dissolution of the material frame through which it was brought into being? The body, ceasing to be a living body, may relapse into its elements when it has "fulfilled" itself, while the true individual, in which that fulfilment con-

sisted, pursues his destiny under new conditions.' It may be added that this conception of the 'soul' implies the doctrine of 'conditional immortality,' a position which the writer expressly adopts at a later stage.

The moral argument for a future life is also rejected. The idea is the necessity of a future life to redress the balance of this life, either in the form of retribution or in the more refined form of compensation. The belief in a future existence would be thus a moral necessity. 'But,' asks the Professor, 'have we any right to stake the whole character of the universe as rational and righteous on the question of our own personal survival or non-survival?' 'The very idea of "justice" as the satisfaction of an individual "right" seems to disappear in the atmosphere of religion.'

Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON finds the most satisfying ground of faith in the theological, or perhaps better the religious, argument. It is the nature of God, and consequently the reality of 'eternal life.' The nature of God is love, and, if so, the value of the finite world to the Spirit of the universe must lie, above all else, in the spirits to whom He has given the capacity 'to make themselves in his own image.' These spirits themselves are values to God. We may conclude, then, that they are not made to be broken up and cast aside and to be replaced by relays of others in a continual succession.

'At such a standpoint, the belief in immortality is not based by the religious man on any personal claim for himself or even for others; it seems rather, as our argument has suggested, to be an inference from the character of God.'

To affirm that the ideals and hopes which have been the nursing-mothers of mankind are 'too good *not* to be true,' is to teach the same conclusion from another starting-point. In other words, 'the idea of immortality has no religious significance, and it loses all credibility, if we separate it from the idea of eternal life as a realized possession.' The immortality of man lies for him in his union with the eternal object on which his affections are set, and he seeks no other assurance.

A Professor of Theology remarked to the writer the other day that no book is so much needed at present in the theological field as a new work on sin, a really big treatment of the subject.

Well, it is certainly a big subject, and bristling with difficulty. It is more difficult now than it used to be. For what the present age needs to be convinced of afresh is the fact of sin, or at least its seriousness. That a sense of the reality of sin is very weak among masses of men, even among professed Christians, admits of no question. They are prepared to consider moral disorder and crime, faults of character and frailties of temperament, but sin?—they can attach little meaning to the term.

One problem that the big man who writes this new book will have to face is the Fall. Was there ever a Fall? If so, what were its nature and significance? It is easy to criticize the views expressed by Canon Barnes and others on the subject of an alleged Fall. But beyond all cavil, modern science, with its key-word evolution, has made the notion of a Fall very difficult to many minds, and not all seem to see just how very difficult it is. To speak as some do, of 'a Fall upwards' is to miss the whole point. If it was upwards, it was not a Fall.

The theologian who is to render modern theology the great service indicated will do well to read a very unpretentious little work which was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES last month—'The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin,' by Mr. E. J. BICKNELL. Therein we find, among other excellent chapters, a specially good one on this difficult subject of the Fall and Original Sin. Let us set down the main point in his own words.

'Without in any way denying the progress of mankind, we hold that the highest kind of progress has been prevented by a falling away from the true line of advance. Sin is that which not only ought not to be, but ought never to have been. . . . We are told that as we follow the upward development of life in this world many species have, as it were, made false steps. They have chosen the easier road and been content to adapt themselves so thoroughly to their present environment that they have reached a state of equilibrium. Advance is no longer possible. They remain stationary. And the inevitable result of this refusal to co-operate with the upward movement is, in the long run, death.'

'We may apply this to the spiritual evolution of the human race. It is perfectly conceivable that the race as a whole has failed to live up to God's purpose. It has developed along wrong lines. Its evolution has been misdirected. . . . If this is so, if the race is evolving along wrong lines due to misdirection in the past, the individual, even though he is in no sense personally responsible, is barred out from God. Each member bears the burden of the misdirection of the race. He is not personally guilty, but he suffers from that moral and spiritual disability which we call original sin.'

'Now, if this view represents the truth, original sin is indeed the grave matter that Christian theology has always supposed. It is no passing weakness that mankind will outgrow. No regression is possible. In nature, steps made in the wrong direction cannot be retraced. Humanity can never save itself. It can never get back on to the right lines.'

A cordial welcome will be given to the first number of a new religious magazine which has just appeared. The name is *The Congregational Quarterly: A Review of Religious Life and Thought*, and it is issued by the Congregational Union of England and Wales. The Editor is Dr. Albert Peel, and on the Editorial Board the name of Dr. W. B. Selbie is included. The interest of the opening issue is of a general nature. Only two of the articles are what may be called theological, but one of these attracts attention at once by its title, and more than maintains the attraction by its merits. It is on 'The Meaning of the Death of Jesus.' The writer is the Rev. A. D. Belden.

Mr. Belden refers at the outset to the difficulties the modern mind feels about the older mechanical theories of the Atonement. Such ideas as the innocent suffering instead of the guilty, of a substitute being punished in the sinner's place, and of a redemption entirely independent of the soul's co-operation, arouse an intense feeling of revolt. The answer of Christian theology to these difficulties has been anything but plain, and the preaching of the Cross has consequently become vague and ineffective in the modern pulpit. The result of this is loss of power.

It is loss of power because the Cross is the supreme symbol of our faith. The New Testament gives a predominant place to the death of Jesus. The greatest fact about Him, according to the Apostles, is that He died. The love of Christ constraineth us because . . . one died for all. Jesus invested the crime of His murder with a redeeming efficacy, and 'all through history the Cross has carried His meaning,' not that of His murderers. It was because the Apostles saw 'His meaning' that He became to them more than a Divine Teacher and awakened their passionate devotion.

It is perfectly clear that Jesus *intended* His sacrifice to be to every sinning soul the proof of a deathless redeeming love. He embraced it wholeheartedly. It was not forced on Him, and we must reject the 'mischievous travesty' of the truth which represents God and Christ as opposed, as punisher and punished. Jesus believed, in His love for men, that His Cross would, at some point and in some way, intervene between them and their sins. 'He died hemmed in by sin on every hand, betrayed by

His followers, forsaken by all . . . yet dying of set intent *for their sins and mine* in a passion of purest love.'

But there must be more than that. Why? What more do we want? There is the key to the whole matter. *We all do want something more.* We want atonement. And that word stands in the human soul, by a deep, undeniable instinct, for compensation—compensation before reconciliation. This is more a demand made by man than by God. A wrong must be righted somehow, and man cannot rest in God's mercy till he knows this will happen. The necessity for atonement is 'a great hungry cry from humanity,' and it is there because it is in God.

Those who deny the necessity of an atonement because God is love forget love's Perfect Equality which we call justice. They forget also that the sinner is part of a society, every member of which is also and equally the object of Divine love. If sin were only a personal insult to God, it might be forgiven easily. But it is more. It is a corporate thing. It is a blow against His other children. We need a new sense of the terrible complications that sin causes. And in every heart there lies a fierce demand that somehow the gaping rents that sin makes in the very fabric of the universe—for the moral law is the world's true structure—shall be mended, wrong righted, and atonement made.

When, therefore, One appears in history bearing the credentials of a moral victory, exquisitely right in all spiritual matters, offering Himself in His travail to redeem us all, saying in effect 'I am the Atonement,' even as He said, 'I am the Truth'—is it too much to say: 'He meets this fundamental hunger of our souls for atonement too perfectly for us to believe Him mistaken? We will believe Him right!'

'If at present we cannot go beyond this, if we cannot yet trace with perfect psychology the entire mystery of how the sacrifice of Christ in death reaches out to defeat sin in the universe that lies beyond our earthly life, and whither, alas! our own personal sin has travelled in its far-reaching consequences, need we refuse on that account this meaning of His death for ourselves here and now?"

The *Hibbert Journal* for January contains an article by Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale University on 'Two Parables of Lost Opportunity,' the purpose of which is to 'restore to more authentic form two much-disputed parables of Jesus.' The primitive tradition, in the period of oral transmission, was marked by a homiletic 'adaptation to the occasion.' But Professor Bacon thinks the period of editing witnessed an even more drastic handling.

The current theory is that 'Matthew' and 'Luke' (Dr. Bacon uses inverted commas in both cases) were indebted for their material to Mark and Q mainly. Q, as it was used by them, was in Greek, but this was a translation of an Aramaic original (S). This was 'perhaps known to Mark, but left by him in comparative neglect.' The material thus derived from Q has been 'adapted' by both the first and third evangelists.

'Matthew' is the bolder and more thorough-going adapter. He turned Mark's parable of the Patient Husbandman, *e.g.*, into the Tares in the Wheat. The section he appended to the parable of the Slighted Invitation (22^{1-14}) is his own 'expansion.' The householder of 'Luke' is transformed by 'Matthew' into the Messianic King. And in other drastic changes he is governed by his desire to show the necessity of good works, and to condemn the teachers of 'lawlessness.'

'Luke' has no such doctrinal idiosyncrasy. He is an historian. He writes to tell things 'in order.' It is true, he has his weaknesses also. The 'Great Interpolation,' *e.g.*, he organizes as a travel document, but the local touches are so transparently artificial that these 'travel-rubrics' are recognized easily as a device of the evangelist and not really

a reflexion of fact. He has his humanitarian tendency also, but this only accounts for his choice of material. And, finally, he is a strict moralist, and tries to safeguard the teaching of Jesus from misuse. He does this frequently. Indeed he is very careful about it, for he not only appends the parable of the Dishonest Steward to safeguard that of the Prodigal Son against misuse, but he appends to the Dishonest Steward two sayings on the use of wealth to safeguard this also from misapplication.

But, with these (and perhaps other) exceptions, he is blameless as compared with 'Matthew'; and the two parables of the Half-shut Door (Lk 13^{22-30}, Mt 7^{13-23}) and the Slighted Invitation (Lk 14^{15-24}, Mt 22^{1-14}) are proof of this. A careful scrutiny of the material shows that Luke's version of the former has unity, authenticity, and consistency, while Matthew has only scattered fragments of it greatly modified in form.

But in both evangelists the motive of the two parables is the same—to guard against antinomianism. In the source the parables of the Kingdom were in a group ending with the Sower. Upon this followed, 'perhaps not immediately, the pair of parables of Lost Opportunity, introduced by a bystander's question. For in the arrangement of the Source it would seem to have been the parable of the Sower which evoked the question: "Lord, are they few that be saved?" to which Jesus replies with the parable of the Half-shut Door.' This parable answers the question with the lesson, 'Now is the day of salvation.' It emphasizes the urgency of immediate repentance. The two later evangelists not unnaturally brought the second of the pair of parables, the Slighted Invitation, into connexion with the fate which Jerusalem had drawn upon itself by its murder of God's messengers.

The whole article is an instructive example of what we venture to call subjective criticism. Criticism has its rights and duties, and it must be left free to pursue these without let or hindrance. But it may not be altogether out of place to plead for a little more reality in criticism. The way in which imagination is allowed confidently to dominate the arrangement of the original sources and their modifications in the process of using them does not appeal to a sense of reality.

At a Y.M.C.A. hut in France, discussion turned on the nature of the Christian life, and a demand was voiced for explicit instruction as to what for each man discipleship would mean. The hut leader pointed out that it was not in accord with the spirit of Christianity to frame a code of rules. John the Baptist gave explicit guidance to various classes in answer to the question, What shall we do? But Jesus, in answer to the same question, replied, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.' Get the Spirit of Christ, said the hut leader, and follow that. But this did not seem to satisfy. 'I want to know,' said one soldier, 'just exactly what I, John Smith, have to do.' This represents a spirit widely prevalent to-day, a spirit which is less concerned with first principles than with their practical application in everyday life. And no doubt it is one of the main duties of the Christian teacher to interpret the faith in terms of men's daily life, and show its relevance to the problems of the hour.

A very interesting book has been issued by the Student Christian Movement, which seeks to bridge the gulf between the cloister and the market-place. It is entitled *Everyday Religion*, by Edward S. Woods, M.A. (5s. net). The various chapters discuss Christianity and Work, Money, Thought, Beauty, Recreation, Sex, and Health. The book is ably written, and its criticisms are vigorous, if at times one-sided. To speak evil of dignities has no terrors to the modern mind, and Mr. Woods is, above all, modern. The Church, as usual, is the principal whipping boy, and a good second is, of course, the Victorian Age.

It illustrates the bias of Mr. Woods' thinking that, while he finds the present industrial order

thoroughly unchristian, his only reference to the great drink evil is a passing remark that 'the ploughboy and the publican, the merchant and the mechanic, need not go outside the shop, the farm, or the factory to express and exhibit the Spirit of Christ.' And again, while he condemns the Church, he quotes with approval a statement that 'most of the younger generation are outside the Churches not because they don't care, but because the Christian organizations are not Christian enough to meet their need.' It is difficult to see what good can come of such a travesty of the actual facts.

Coming to constructive work, Mr. Woods acknowledges that 'idealists are trying people because they are frequently so vague. Those of us who believe that our present industrial and social arrangements are a remarkably poor attempt to solve the old problem of human living together are often asked what exactly we should propose to put in the place of the present system. That question I will try to answer.' What is the answer? What is the substitute for the present industrial system? It is to be a system marked by three characteristics—service, co-operation, and humanity. All that Mr. Woods has to say on these topics is admirable, but how far does this take us? The Christian individualist would give as hearty assent to this teaching as would the socialist. Why then speak as if it implied the overthrow of the present industrial order? Why speak as if the Kingdom of God were bound up with a certain economic theory? The best thing about Mr. Woods' book is that in the end he preaches the old remedy for 'the old woe o' the world,' and if his manner of preaching it proves effective in this new age, Christians of every school of economics will heartily rejoice.

The Development of Thought within the Fourth Gospel.

By the Reverend R. H. Strachan, D.D., Edinburgh.

II.

All that has been said in the previous article constitutes an attempt to describe the kind of thought and attitude towards the historical facts of the Christian faith which we find in the Fourth Gospel. The ultimate intention has been to lead up to another question, Is it possible to trace in the Gospel any plan of internal development which determines the course of thought of the Evangelist? His thought is a kind of thought that is emancipated from any mere bondage to actual historical fact. He is a preacher expounding a theme; a haggadist bringing out hidden meanings in the traditional material and suggesting a providential order in the history; a profound Christian, whose inward loyalty of love to Christ has quickened his spiritual vision to behold the life of Jesus and His disciples as an unchanging drama, a conflict between Light and Darkness, Love and Hate, Truth and Unreality.

It does seem possible to trace a plan which has determined the Evangelist's course of thought right through the Gospel. In a general way, he himself tells us the plan. In $20^{30.31}$ he says, 'Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written (you have the book in its present form), that ye may believe (go on believing) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name.' He asserts: (1) That he has made a selection out of the available historical material. (2) That he intends to use the material before him in such a fashion as to strengthen and deepen the faith of his readers. Apparently he has chiefly in view those who are already Christian.

We shall, therefore, be prepared to find that 'faith' or 'belief' is a dominant idea in the Fourth Gospel. In a sense, we are stating the truth in-

correctly. The noun—πίστις—does not occur at all in the Gospel, and only once in the first Epistle (1 Jn 5^4). Not faith in the abstract, but 'faith'—'belief in action,' believing examples of faith, varieties of faith illustrated in actual persons and incidents—these, together with their opposites, unbelieving hostility and rejection, are the themes of the Fourth Gospel. And there is a more or less formal arrangement of incidents and discourses in the Gospel, illustrating different phases, stages, and kinds of faith; beams of the 'Light shining in darkness.'

In order to illustrate the grouping of events and sayings in the Gospel, and to show that the development of thought is not formed by mere historical and chronological arrangement, we may take what I regard as the most significant use of an incident in the Gospel—the Cleansing of the Temple. In the diagnosis of disease, the symptoms may, for a time, be those connected with one or other of two diseases. The two may seem to run for a time in parallel lines, until at length a certain symptom appears which is decisive. The two lines cross one another, and, in the phrase of the old physicists, we have the crucial instance, the *instantia crucis*. The Cleansing of the Temple, narrated at the very beginning of the ministry, is a 'crucial instance' in determining the development of the thought in the Gospel. You may treat the story as an incident inserted in its proper place, and suggest that there were two cleansings; or you may set aside all such notions, and assume that there was some special reason, other than historical, for inserting the story where it stands. Undoubtedly, if we are not to despair of the historical value of the Synoptic record, it is there introduced as the act which precipitated the final crisis of the crucifixion. In the Synoptic Gospels it stirs the smouldering enmity into a blaze: in the Fourth Gospel it provokes only a mild protest. Why then should it be introduced here at all? I would suggest that its introduction is the key to the Evangelist's use of all narrative. It is introduced for the sake of the interpretation to which a certain famous saying of Jesus,—'Destroy this temple'—incorporated in the traditional narrative before the Evangelist, lends itself. The saying enters into the charges brought against Jesus at His trial. You will notice that in the course of the short, sharp controversy that follows the story in this Gospel, the saying is interpreted by the Evangelist as a prophecy of the Resurrection, and of all that is involved in the Resurrection. Apart from its use at the trial, it is recorded only in John in its historical setting. The nearest Synoptic approach to it is in Mt 12^6, 'One greater than the temple is here,' where the context is the claim to supersede ritual observance in the cause of humanity. Probably this is the original significance of the saying, and it is not merely a prophecy of the Resurrection as the Evangelist interprets it. The Resurrection, however, made possible its fulfilment. The Resurrection fills all the Evangelist's mind at the moment, and the faith it produced. He wishes to emphasize a certain stage in the growth of faith in Jesus in the hearts of the disciples. 'When, therefore, he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.'

It is to be noted that from 1^{35}, right on to 2^{22}, the growth of faith in Jesus, how the disciples came to believe in Jesus, is the dominant note. Notice $1^{50.\ 51}$ 2^{11} 2^{22}. Each of these verses marks a stage of faith, a lower, a higher, and the highest. In the first passage, Nathanael believes in Jesus because He saw him under the fig-tree; had by a marvellous insight divined that he was a man who had secret spiritual struggles in the privacy of his own home, of which he could speak to none. There is also the great variety of ways by which the disciples came to Jesus—through the ministry of the Baptist, through the ministry of a brother, through a chance meeting. In all these cases an instantaneous effect was produced, and they followed Jesus. He had by one way or another found a place in their hearts. They loved him for what He had done personally for them. Of their faith, Jesus Himself says that faith bounded by individual experience is only a stage. 'Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these. Verily, verily, I say unto you (plural), Ye shall see the heaven opened (opened and remaining open), and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.' They shall see the abiding gracious ministry of the Father in the earthly ministry of His Son—the 'solemn parting of clouds of divine Providence' displayed that men 'may gaze into the mystery beyond.' Jesus is the ladder on which the angels of God ascend from and descend to the life of men. It is a summary of the significance of the whole earthly ministry. The disciples' faith will

grow as their vision and experience of the scope of Jesus' ministry is enlarged.

In 2^{1-11} we have a typical instance of the exercise of this wider ministry. It may be said in passing that the miracle is probably selected—out of the traditional material at the Evangelist's disposal—for its symbolic significance, and that there is an allusiveness in the turning of water into wine. Is it the turning of the water of Jewish ceremonial religion into the wine of the Christian Gospel? Jesus is not only Jacob's but humanity's ladder. However that may be, it is important to note that Jesus is not represented as taking a guest's part at the feast, though He is bidden as a guest. He is behind the scenes, in the kitchen as it were, unobtrusively exercising His ministry of compassion, saving the face of an unknown host. None knew who had provided the wine, save the servants, and presumably the disciples. Jesus remains in humble obscurity. In that miracle, it is stated in 2^{11}, Jesus manifested His 'glory,' His 'character,' showed who He was; and on grounds like these His disciples believed on Him. As yet, however, theirs was a faith founded on the facts of the earthly ministry, and especially on the 'signs' or 'miracles,' and therefore not yet a perfect faith.

Thus we reach *the crowning stage of faith* in 2^{22}, the Resurrection-faith. 'They believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.' To 'believe the scripture' is to realize the meaning of prophecy, to see Jesus foreshadowed in prophecy. That, in modern language, was equivalent to saying that Jesus was the fulfilment of the world's hope, and that His coming was founded on the eternal laws that govern the universe. Jesus' life and mission were 'no Divine freak or caprice,' to quote Professor Burkitt, 'but a part of a well-ordered whole. To the pious Jew, the utterances of the Prophets had very much the same place in their idea of the world as what we call the Laws of Nature have for us.'[1] It is the special purpose of the Gospel of Matthew to display Jesus as the fulfilment of prophecy, and although we may dissent from some of the interpretations the first Evangelist puts on individual prophecies, his method is already an approach to giving Jesus that cosmic significance which He has in Paul and in the Johannine Gospel. The latter says that the climax of faith is reached when the disciples 'believed the scripture, and the *word* which Jesus had said.' To the Evangelist, Jesus is much more than the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy, or the foreshadowings of the law. He is—even in his passing 'words'—the fulfilment of all that *Logos* stood for in the popular philosophy of the Hellenistic world. *Logos* was one of those popular terms much in use in the end of the first century in circles where men were sitting loose to the old tradition, and were feeling, as we feel, the spirit of a new Age. It is practically certain that John has not in view any particular philosophical system, but was very much in touch with popular thought. 'Jesus Christ,' he virtually says, 'is what you are really seeking. He is the Logos.' The Logos is just the answer to all:

> 'the reasons of the wherefore, and the causes of the why,'

the quest for which possessed men's souls.

Thus, in that section of the Gospel which we have been considering we have three stages of faith, three ascending stages, illustrated by various traditional incidents in the history of Jesus and His disciples.

(1) Faith based upon an immediate personal experience.

(2) Faith based on observation of the outward ministry of Jesus. The incident described in 2^{1-11} may be taken as a 'typical' miracle.[2] It is characteristic or typical, chiefly because the working of Jesus takes place in the background. It is apparent only to those who have eyes to see. Such a vision of His 'glory' or 'character' only gradually unfolded itself as the disciples followed Him, not only through the cities and villages, but, to borrow with Mr. T. R. Glover a phrase of Wordsworth, 'in all the fluxes and refluxes' of His thought. The silent, unobtrusive, gracious ministry of God was revealed. Heaven was open, according to the promise to Nathanael.

(3) The full Resurrection Faith. This spiritual ministry is the satisfaction of the whole world's longing and need in the eternal purpose of God. The 'Logos' has become flesh. The Resurrection has set this 'incarnation' free for all men, including 'them that have not seen.' Of these latter, the Evangelist, brooding on the traditional record of events and sayings, is one.

This passage 1^{35}–2^{22} is taken as a striking ex-

[1] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 201.

[2] Origen in his *Commentary* (Ed. Brooke, i. p. 196) so interprets ἀρχή in 2^{11}; not first in point of time, but first in significance.

ample of the Evangelist's method of developing his thought.[1] This section is immediately followed by a set of three narratives and discourses, Nicodemus, the Samaritan Woman, the Nobleman of Capernaum. In this latter section the growth of faith is illustrated by the attitude of three people of different nationalities, the Jew, the Samaritan, the Roman, or Gentile.

Does this hypothesis of an ideal sequence, as an attempt to explain the development of the thought within the Gospel, cover all the facts? The hypothesis is that all through there is an ideal scheme, containing a logical order. This ideal scheme may explain why the Cleansing of the Temple is set where it is, but it is apparently contradicted by the appearance of *a chronological scheme*, which also runs through the Gospel. The various incidents and sections are from time to time connected up in chronological sequence. We have, for example, the rather inconsequent words of 2^{12}. Again, the Marriage at Cana is said to have taken place on 'the third day,' that is, the third day after the events recorded in connexion with the calling of the disciples, and the witness of the Baptist. These happenings appear to have occupied four days, so that one week is occupied altogether; but how could the disciples of Jesus be bidden to the wedding, as disciples, considering the length of invitation necessary?

It is, of course, always open to any one to say that an author who deals so freely with the traditional material of our Lord's ministry as to fit it into an ideal scheme is also capable of forcing it into a chronological scheme, such as is indicated, in order to give his work more the appearance of the traditional Gospel, with its connected narrative and ordered sequence of events. Questions, however, arise in the mind, when we observe that generally in these connecting passages[2] a strong emphasis is laid on the Galilean ministry. This rather points to the work of an Editor who has felt that the original Evangelist has made too exclusive use of the tradition of a Jerusalem ministry. Further questions are raised by the treatment of the Lazarus story. It is impossible not to feel that this story owes much of its difficulty to editorial work upon it. The idea of the original Evangelist, it is suggested, was to use the Lazarus story, a story of raising from the dead like the Jairus story, so as to make it reflect the appropriate idea, in view of the Passion that was imminent, of Jesus as Lord of life and death. The sickness of a dear friend, Lazarus, also provided the occasion for the final visit to Jerusalem, and itself caused perplexity in the mind of our Lord. The dominant note in our Lord's consciousness of His death in the Fourth Gospel is, 'I lay down my life of myself: no man taketh it from me.' He is represented as critical of suggestions from without, mediated even through affection towards Him on the part of His mother (2^4), or His brethren ($7^{3ff.}$), or the family at Bethany (11^{56}). These endanger that 'autonomy' which characterizes the consciousness of Jesus in this Gospel, and which owns no allegiance save to the will of God alone.

In the Gospel as it stands, however, the story of Lazarus is more than a transparent narrative, through which there shines the glory of Jesus as Conqueror of Death. It is made to take the historical place occupied by the Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics, as the occasion of the final outburst of hostility and hatred. It has become a stupendous miracle, viewed by a crowd, and provokes the ultimate and decisive action of the ecclesiastical authorities.

This whole question requires much fuller consideration than can here be given to it. Meantime, it is suggested that there are these two contradictory schemes of thought running all through the Gospel, particularly in chapters 1–12. Briefly, the only hypothesis that can explain the appearance of the chronological scheme is that a later Editor has so linked up the original material arranged on a purely ideal scheme, in order to assimilate the work to the traditional and conventional Gospel, like the Synoptic narratives. The Gospel is not 'a seamless robe.' There are probably three strata: (1) The original—mostly 'Johannine' tradition; (2) the fitting of that tradition into an ideal scheme; (3) an Editor who has superimposed on this a chronological scheme.

[1] For a plan of this ideal sequence, carried through the whole Gospel, reference may be made to pp. 55 ff. of my book, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment.*

[2] A list of these passages will be found in my *Fourth Gospel*, p. 59; and a fuller treatment of them from the grammatical point of view in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxvii. pp. 22 ff. Principal Garvie has subjected the whole theory to a searching criticism in his recent valuable book, *The Beloved Disciple.*

Literature.

AN INTERESTING CENTENARY.

The Divinity School at Yale has been celebrating its centenary. Here is a volume, *Education for Christian Service* (Milford: Oxford University Press; 15s. net). A proud little preface tells us that Yale has had three thousand six hundred and eighteen students, that two hundred and fifty of them have gone as missionaries, that over six hundred have become professors, and more than one hundred principals. That is a noble record, and it is deserved. For the Faculty, judged by our standards, seems very up to date and thorough in the course of study it provides. There is not only a professor of Theology, but one of Biblical Theology, and yet a third of Practical Theology. More interesting is it to find that they have Chairs of the Spiritual Content of Literature (surely a fascinating subject), of the Philosophy of Religion, of Missions, of Christian Nurture, and of Christian Methods, and, to name one more, a Chair of Practical Philanthropy. The curriculum is a full one, and the staff is excellent. Each of the Professors contributes a paper on his own subject to the volume. The Dean, Dr. C. Reynolds Brown, opens with a fine and readable plea for a ministry, and especially for preaching, really efficient to meet the needs of our puzzled age. But, probably, most readers will turn first to Dr. Bacon's article. It is all very well for a distinguished theologian to write in a private letter about 'a wild man on a monoplane,' but Dr. Bacon usually forces you to think. And yet, while the papers of the better known men are entirely competent and good, it is never impossible to lay down the book. The real liveliness is provided by the occupants of the newer type of Chair. Dr. Tweedy has a very interesting paper on Training in Worship—alive to our defects, and pleading for a worthy service, yet hopefully comparing us with the rough-and-tumble methods that have too often prevailed in days gone by; and cleverly meeting wailing voices that allege much decadence, by pointing out that Gilbert Murray tells us that one of the oldest clay tablets found in Babylon begins, 'Alas! Alas! times are not what they were!' And Dr. Bainton, while admitting that there is no necessary progress, declares that we are moving forward, and gives proofs of it so terrible in their revelations of the horrors in the record of the Church that we can only gasp, 'And it is time.' There are articles on the different types of Evangelism, on the Church and Education, on Theology in a Scientific Age, all fresh and to the point. Quite evidently, what with the fine scheme of training, and such live minds to teach them, Yale men ought to make notable ministers.

LOVE AND SEX.

Two books have recently been published which deal with the emotional life of the race from different standpoints and with different motives, but which do not differ widely in their main conception of it. One is Emil Lucka's *The Evolution of Love* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), and the other, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, by the famous psychologist Freud (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net).

Lucka, the brilliant young Austrian poet-philosopher, has produced a work which is remarkable in many ways. It is a notable sign of the tendency in present-day thought away from materialism and towards a spiritual conception of reality. But it is worth reading for its own sake. The writer has an extraordinary acquaintance with the great literature of the world and with the facts of history, and he is the master of his knowledge. He has a wide outlook, and works with large ideas. Some of his generalizations will be rejected, but no one can refuse tribute to the intellectual mastery of his book or to the idealism that pervades it.

The main contention of Lucka is that love is not a primary instinct, but has been gradually evolved in historical times. Along with this he asserts that the well-known biogenetic law, that the individual repeats in himself all the stages the race has gone through, ought to be regarded as 'psychogenetic' also; that is to say, the same is true of man's spiritual history. There are, roughly, three stages in the history of love. First, that of simple sexuality, unrelieved by any spiritual quality. This is the primitive stage. Then the period, ushered in by Christianity, which sought the centre of life in the soul. Love now became idealized and sublimated. The Crusades, Chivalry, the

Holy Grail, the cult of the Virgin Mary are expressions of this new conception. The third stage brings us to the modern conception, the blending of spiritual and sensual love. In our time love is devotion to the whole personality of the loved one. It is a synthesis of sense and soul. It is love of what is fully human. Of love in this sense the ancients knew nothing. Such is a brief indication of the trend of a volume which contains many fascinating chapters dealing with the history of man's upward striving.

Freud's book is, of course, on different lines. In this volume the celebrated psycho-analyst turns the light of his searching mind on the social instincts or the 'herd.' He reviews the contributions of Le Bon, McDougall and Trotter, with whose names 'group psychology' is associated. He accepts the two main conclusions of these writers, that the influence of the herd on the individual is to intensify his emotions and to inhibit his intellect and will, but he refuses to accept their explanations. He thinks the herd instinct is not a primary fact, but is reducible to certain elements, or rather to one. He finds the explanation of the influence of the group in love. For this purpose love is interpreted in a wide sense, which would include friendship and loyalty and patriotism, but ultimately it has its roots in the senses. Love relationships are the essence of the group mind. The group was originally a *horde* with a leader, and the connecting link was loyalty. This theory is worked out with ingenuity in two examples, the Church and the Army; but it is singularly unconvincing. Indeed it seems to us arbitrary and artificial. Love, rooted in sex, is Freud's 'King Charles's Head,' and the persistence with which he applies it as the key to every human problem reminds us of Cheyne with his 'Jerahmeel' theory. It is true that in this book love appears to be sublimated, but it is never far away from its roots in sense. We do not think Freud's contribution will give much trouble to the recognized expounders of group psychology; but, as was to be expected, his Essay is intensely interesting and full of suggestion. It is also marked by a largeness of mind that makes it attractive and even inspiring.

DAN CRAWFORD.

It is more than ten years since 'Thinking Black' appeared, and during these years Mr. Crawford has, we believe, published nothing except a small volume of sermons which he very modestly called Readings, and to which he gave the title 'Thirsting after God.' Now, at last, we have the successor to 'Thinking Black'—*Back to the Long Grass* (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s. net).

We have been waiting impatiently for it, and now that it has come what are we to say of it? Well, we can say that it was worth waiting for. Not that it is a polished piece of work; indeed, it is often curiously inconsequential, for, on the one hand, Mr. Crawford can refuse a place to nothing African if there is the chance that it may throw any light on Scripture, nor, on the other hand, can he bear to exclude anything which might throw any light on the African mind. For Mr. Crawford is still 'thinking black,' and he forces us to 'think black' with him. At the beginning of Chapter II. he says: 'Let it be known, the more we get to know these natives the more we find that "folks is folks." The very "Bantu" [people] applied to these negroid peoples gives the game away. It is generic not specific, Angels and Chinese are also "bantu," therefore no higher compliment can any native pay Europeans than by calling them "Bantu." Yet we coolly murder the meaning of this word and use it as a selective label for a special brand of blackish-brown folk, named, misnamed, "Bantu." It is all amusingly suggestive of the white man's failure to realize that there is no radical difference between black and white, and his own boomerang "Bantu" rebounds to claim him as its own.'

Dan Crawford describes himself as 'one of the Livingstone lot who seek to go steadily and soberly on for God'; and in this book, where he takes us back again with him to the long grass of Central Africa, we find that Livingstone is the link which binds all the incidents together. For the book is built on Livingstone's last journey. We follow Mr. and Mrs. Crawford north first, until we have the description of Livingstone's 'Long last mile' and death at Ilăla, and then we go south along their pioneer route through Kazembe and Mieremiere to the grave of Livingstone's heart.

Back to the Long Grass is an arresting piece of work, full of humour, trenchant criticism, and suggestive descriptions; and, difficult though it is at times, we are never tempted to turn back like the explorer of whom Mr. Crawford speaks. There

is an African proverb that when 'puddle dries the tadpole dies,' and, speaking of this proverb, Mr. Crawford says he knew an explorer who turned back to the ocean from near Tanganyika because his Lee & Perrin's sauce supply had run out. But let Mr. Crawford tell the story himself. 'Why should the explorer not follow L. & P.'s example and run out likewise? True, he deserted his companion, but this also was what the sauce did to the soup. The puddle was drying, so this tadpole of an explorer was dying for the culinary consolations of London. Besides, what about that "promised" book of African travels to be seen through the press?'

The volume contains a large number of illustrations, and these are as attractive and original as the writing.

DANTE AGAIN.

Of the making of books on Dante there is no end. And still they come. Here is yet another, not too pretty on its outside, but beautifully printed on fine paper, with sixteen excellent illustrations, and admirably written. Whether there is any crying need for it is, perhaps, open to question. But if another account of the poet's life and work and character were required, here it is done thoroughly well by Miss Mary Bradford Whiting. *Dante the Man and the Poet* (Heffer; 9s. net) is as good as any of the shorter studies of the strange mind that has so fascinated the imagination of his fellows. What is one to make of that proud, aloof, deeply religious man who could yet write to the Emperor, 'The feet of the most holy Conqueror,' etc., 'are kissed by his most devoted servant, Dante Alighieri,' and begs him to hurry, 'for men are beginning to cry: "Art thou he who should come, or do we look for another?"' When I saw you, silently I said to myself, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Wherefore come quickly.' By the way, Carlyle, it seems, was wrong when in his vivid way he told us that Dante knew the father of Francesca, and may well have taken on his knee as a wee lass the unhappy one whom he afterwards consigned to hell—a fact which always stuck fast in the throat. It was really her nephew who was Dante's friend; which makes things somewhat better. There is much knowledge concealed in this easily read book.

MAN AND IMMORTALITY.

Professor James Y. Simpson, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.E., has followed up his suggestive book 'The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature' by another, which he describes as a sequel, entitled *Man and the Attainment of Immortality* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). This work attempts 'to consider as a whole certain of the principal facts relating to the past history, present situation, and ultimate destiny of mankind.' It covers, in short, the meeting-ground of science, philosophy, and theology.

It is exceedingly well written, and is embellished with numerous illustrations. For those who have no time for specialized and minute study of the long history of human development, it will amply suffice as a clear and trustworthy account of the conclusions of science as to man's antiquity and origin, and his rise through palæolithic, mesolithic, and neolithic epochs. All this and the chapters on evolution are to the point. We are not so sure about the chapter on 'The Place and Function of Nationality.' It does not seem to be necessary to the development of the real theme of the book, and strikes us as an interruption.

What is most interesting, and what will give rise to keenest discussion, is the author's view on human immortality. The whole course of man's history, as science sets it forth, suggests strongly that immortality is not an inherent characteristic of man's spirit, but an attainment. In his chapter on 'The Scriptural Doctrine of Immortality' the author tries to show that Scripture confirms 'the contention that eternal life—continuity of personal existence—is morally conditioned, that man, in short, is immortable' (a dreadful word!) 'rather than immortal.' Now, as an argument for a theory of Conditionalism, the chapter is good. But taken as what it calls itself—the scriptural doctrine of immortality—it is not good at all.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF RELIGION.

We have read this work, *The Reconstruction of Religion*, by Charles A. Ellwood (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), with great pleasure and much profit. The author describes the present chaotic state of the world, and warns us that we are threatened with the collapse of civilization and the recrudescence of barbarism. Barbarism was reviving before the War, which was merely the most pronounced

symptom of the world's malady. This has been pointed out in the columns of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES before now. According to Dr. Ellwood, the position is serious but not hopeless. There is hope for civilization, for humanity, in true Religion. Religion itself, however, is in a state of revolution, and only if it emerge in new form, or at least with change of emphasis, can the situation be saved. Traditionalism must go. All the results of Science must be frankly and fully accepted. Much of dogma must go. Christianity must make the most complete use of 'the rich contribution which the sociological sciences can make to practical religion.' The Church must show that Christianity, rightly understood, is the true Religion of Humanity, and that the service of God implies the service of man.

In his analysis of the present distress we agree with every word that Dr. Ellwood has written. We are not quite so enthusiastic about his constructive suggestions. They sound rather familiar. They may not, however, be so familiar in America, and it is America that is primarily in the author's mind.

THE INTERPRETERS.

The Interpreters, by A. E. (Macmillan ; 6s. net), is a book well worth reading. The writer belongs to the brotherhood of mystic poets and has been classified as a nature-mystic—a worshipper of earth's beauty ; not a worshipper in a pagan sense, however, but one who regards earth as 'the perfect sacrament in which symbol and reality are made one.' Further, A. E. is an example of a striking spiritual development. In his revealing poem 'Reconciliation' he passes from—

> I begin through the grass again to be bound to the Lord

to—

> By the hand of a child I am led to the throne of the King.

Viewed from the angle of *The Interpreters*, we see him led to the 'throne of the King' by sympathy with his fellow-countrymen. An Irishman to the heart's core, he loves them with a love that understands, and only the other day was given an official commission in the cause of peace.

In the preface of *The Interpreters* he writes : 'I have been intimate with some who risked and with some who lost life for causes to which they were devoted, and came to understand that with many the political images in imagination were but the psychic body of spiritual ideas.' What he gives us in the book reads almost like a prophetic utterance. A company of men of a future generation are moved to rebellion. Experiencing the terrible joy of life which had been emancipated, they had risen from the grave which was fear. Their rebellion fails, and they find themselves in prison. They waken as if from a dream, gay with a spiritual gaiety, 'for on the morrow they might be standing with their backs to the wall taking a wild farewell of the sky, drinking greedily the last drop of life before a voice called on the executioners to fire.' Situated thus, a poet, a writer, a socialist, an historian, and an artist become the Interpreters of life. To them the man in the street had become faint as a shadow, those in sympathy had come to a mystic union in the spirit, every heart felt its own beating. The poet goes back over his life, and in him we recognize A. E. He remembers how 'he was smitten through and through with another being and knew it was the earth.' At the end of the book, just before the prisoners received the news that the arsenal where they were imprisoned was to be blown up, in speaking of the poet, A. E. says: 'Never was he so remote from the vision of life, and never more intimate with being. Everything was understood. Everything was loved. Everything was forgiven. He knew after that exaltation he could never be the same again. Never could he be fierce or passionate. . . . He saw the old historian seated beside him. . . . he whispered to the poet, "You have come nigh to the Kingdom. You have seen the Kingdom." Because of that recognition Lavelle [the poet] felt the old man more the intimate of his spirit than even that beauty he had so long remembered and loved, but which had never shared with him the revelation of the Eternal.'

The Interpreters is not only a notable addition to present-day mystical literature ; it is a sympathetic revelation of the soul of a people.

THE LHOTA NAGAS.

There are two classes to whom ethnology is deeply indebted. They are Christian missionaries

and British Government officials. It would not be too much to say that between them they have supplied the bulk of the material available for the study of the lower races. The Government of Assam has now aided in the publication of *The Lhota Nagas*, by Mr. J. P. Mills, I.C.S. (Macmillan; 25s. net). It is a careful and competent study of the habits, customs and beliefs of one of the hill tribes of Assam, and the work is specially valuable and opportune as putting on record phases of tribal life which are fast disappearing.

The Lhota is declared to be 'the Scot among the Naga tribes,' and, though Mr. Mills does not note the fact, this seems amply substantiated in the triumph song of the contingent who served in the Great War, the climax of which contains some touches that are characteristically Scotch:

We have routed the enemies of the Sahib.
We braves of the Mountains are coming back.
Let our women folk at home hear the news.
Let them meet us with drinks of 'madhu.'
Bid them come and meet us on the road.
They have given us money as countless as grains of ash on the hearth,
But he who gives thought to it,
Only he will keep his money.

It is, of course, outwith the purpose of this book to deal with mission work among the Lhotas, but such slight references as are made to it are distinctly unsympathetic. The writer of the introduction, Mr. J. H. Hutton, C.I.E., regards it as matter for congratulation that Mr. Mills' interest in Lhota customs and beliefs has led to a partial revival of native religion. Surely this is extraordinarily shortsighted. If the British Government has cast out the devils of head-hunting and other inhuman practices, it cannot leave the soul of a people swept and garnished. It must find something to fill the void, else will other devils enter in and the last state of that people be worse than the first. Doubtless the ancestral religion is better than none, but if the ancestral religion is inevitably doomed it is futile to countenance its revival. If mission work tends to destroy any healthy elements of tribal life, the remedy is a more intelligent presentation and practice of the Christian faith. In any case, even the Lhotas have their inalienable rights in Christ.

THE COMPANION BIBLE.

This handsome volume fills us with amazement. The more we dip into it the greater does our astonishment become. It fascinates us by its anonymity. What mind in our time is such a repository of little-known lore, so up to date in some respects, so sure of itself that it can date the Flood without hesitation, and regard all typically modern Biblical science as less than nothing and vanity?

Here we have the views of Scripture of perhaps two hundred years ago held in all their pristine vigour. The plenary inspiration of the text; the traditional authorship of all the Books; the literal truth of every detail recorded; the history of the human race beginning in 4004 B.C.; the long sojourn upon earth of the antediluvians—it is all absolutely indisputable fact. The Bible always means what it says and is infallibly true. But we observe some curious points about this doctrine. The text turns out to be not always so straightforward and simple as it looks. The serpent of Eden, for instance, was not really a serpent. The most rationalistic grounds are adduced for holding that it could not possibly be a serpent. It was a *nachash, i.e.* a 'shining one,' therefore an angel. Arguments from etymology are often ingenious, as this is; but often, as here, their ingenuity is their only merit. Then, although it says in Gn 2^6 that 'a mist went up from the earth,' we are here instructed that the very opposite is the real meaning—no mist went up. Again, a simple soul might pardonably fancy that Gn 1^2 carries the story of the first verse smoothly forward. No mistake, according to *The Companion Bible*, could well be greater. Ages roll between verse 1 and verse 2, and fossils are relics of a creation that miserably perished. Who is sufficient for these things?

The 198 Appendixes contain much matter that is useful amid a mass of stuff that it would be a devastation of the human intellect to try to grasp. The fanciful allegorization of the signs of the Zodiac, the portentous list of figures of speech with their learned names, for which no sane person will care a brass farthing, the chronological charts with their startling distinction of *anno mundi* from *anno Dei*, and many other things, are simply lumber fitted to drug or paralyse the mind, and cause us to regard this well-appointed volume as

being, on the whole, a monument of wasted ingenuity. *The Companion Bible* (Milford : Oxford University Press ; cloth, 40s. net ; leather, 52s. 6d. net).

We can never have too many books which attempt to re-state the main truths of the Christian religion. We therefore welcome Dr. J. Wilson Harper's new book, which he calls *The Essentials of Religion* (Allen & Unwin ; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Harper is known rather for his books on the social applications of Christianity. He is also an educationist of distinction. In this work he has broken new ground, but he carries into it his proved interest in the practical implications of truth, for his point of view throughout is that religion reveals itself in life and is tested by realities. Religion, and especially the Christian religion, justifies itself finally by the light it throws on life, on moral freedom, on social problems and on the problems of thought. Dr. Harper is not afraid of definite doctrine, since in his judgment only those religions survive which carry with them definite beliefs ; and the faith stated and defended here is a full-bodied version of Christianity. This is a book which reveals wide reading and independent thought, and is an earnest and able contribution to the literature of its subject.

The Cambridge University Press has issued as one of its 'Patristic Texts' a volume by the late Mr. A. S. Walpole on *Early Latin Hymns* (15s. net). It is a book that will delight hymnologists by the beauty of its form and the wealth of its scholarship. Mr. Walpole reminds one of Browning's Grammarian. He, too, died with his beloved work unfinished, eager as ever over it ; and he, too, thought no pains excessive to make certain of even the minutest points. So enormous was the mass of notes and such like which had been accumulated that Dr. Mason, who has edited the volume, found himself in some embarrassment, and was forced in some degree to depart from the original plan, which was to print all the hymns actually sung up to the year 600. What we have is an interesting introduction, and then the one hundred and twenty-seven hymns here given, with a preface to each, and abundance of notes on almost every line of the Latin text, always scholarly, and often giving curious information.

If evangelism can be taught as an art, surely the Americans can do it, for over there it has been organized in the most systematic way. At any rate, Dr. Hallock, the writer of many homiletic books, and a busy pastor besides, believes that a great deal can be done in this way. He has written a large volume called *The Evangelistic Cyclopædia* (Doran ; $3 net), which is full of matter useful and interesting to evangelists and to busy ministers who need material for evangelistic work. There are five hundred revival texts and themes (all set out with divisions), then four hundred and fifty evangelistic illustrations, followed by two hundred evangelistic outlines and sketches (much fuller than the first selection). After these divisions come chapters on 'Methods of Evangelism,' 'Decision Day,' 'Pastoral Evangelism,' and 'Vocational Evangelism.' And finally there are ten famous revival sermons by Spurgeon, Moody, M'Cheyne, John M'Neill, and others. Much labour has been spent on this remarkable book, and it seems to us extraordinarily well done, and likely to be useful if it is used wisely.

Traditionalism dies hard. In the *Syllabus for Old Testament Study* (Doran ; $2) and *The Heart of the Old Testament* (Doran ; $1.75) it has, however, been made by Professor John R. Sampey as plausible as a convinced and sympathetic advocate can make it. The *Syllabus* furnishes a useful and comparatively detailed outline of the various books of the Old Testament, ending with a conventional statement of the Messianic argument. But it is not very edifying at this time of day to be informed that the Book of Jonah was 'probably written by Jonah himself,' nor at any time of day to be told that the Book of Job 'probably belongs between 1500 and 600 B.C.'

The Heart of the Old Testament carries us into the spiritual content of the Old Testament, and here it will usefully guide the uninitiated. Dr. Sampey always speaks with respect of the critics, but he seldom shares their views. It is really too late in the day to be asked to believe that Gn 1^{26} contains a foreshadowing of the doctrine of the Trinity, or that David composed the many psalms ascribed to him, or that the Book of Isaiah is a unity. The day for views like these is passing, if it is not already past.

Scientific Christian Thinking for Young People

(Doran ; $1.25) is an attempt by Howard Agnew Johnston, D.D., to show to the young that 'one is in full harmony with scientific thinking when holding to the fundamentals of the Christian religion.' For the most part the book is a compilation of extracts from writers whom the compiler holds to be authorities in their respective spheres. Some of it is wise, some not so wise. The doctrine of evolution and the critical theories of the O.T. are by no means so discredited and likely to be discarded as Dr. Johnston thinks.

Messrs. Wells Gardner have just issued a volume of sermons—*Rebuilding the Walls*—by the Right Reverend A. F. Winnington Ingram, D.D., at the very reasonable price of 3s. 6d. The Preface, written on Armistice Day, 1922, explains the choice of title, 'Rebuilding the Walls.' The Bishop asks, 'Is not this just what we have been trying to do during these last four years since the Armistice, and is it not essential that we shall really do so, if we are to be faithful to the memory of the gallant men whom we commemorate to-day?' The task is hard, and will be long. 'Nevertheless, build we must ; slowly and painfully, confidence between nations must be restored ; all Christendom must throw its weight into establishing a League of Nations.' But there can be no sure building without a sure foundation. The sermons in this volume point to the only sure foundation, Jesus Christ, for 'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'

The subject of Pharisaic religion in and about the time of our Lord is one that needs a good deal of investigation. A new book on this subject, or one aspect of it, is therefore welcome, more especially since it comes from the Jews' College, London, a college which exists to train Rabbis, Readers, and Teachers of religion for Jewish congregations—*Types of Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.: The Ancient Pious Men*, by Adolph Büchler, Ph.D., Principal of the Jews' College. The book is a careful and well-informed inquiry into the kind of men the 'Pious' of that age were. A long chapter is devoted to Hillel, another to certain contemporaries ('The Ancient Pious Men'), a third to the Pious Men of the Psalms of Solomon, and a final quaint chapter to 'Honi the Hasid, and his Prayer for Rain.' The whole thing is intensely interesting. It bears out the picture of the better Judaism which we find in the New Testament. There is the same deep piety and sound (even beautiful) character. But the goodness is often self-conscious and a little dramatic, and it is joined to a scrupulosity which is frequently morbid and largely legalistic. Even in so favourable a representation as Dr. Büchler's there is a great deal that enables us to understand the severity of Jesus in His criticism of Pharisaism. However, we are grateful for Dr. Büchler's essay, which is marked by great knowledge and accurate scholarship, and which gives a vivid picture of the period to which it is devoted.

The American Jewish Year Book, 5683, from September 23rd, 1922, to September 10th, 1923 (The Jewish Publication Society of America), is a volume of nearly six hundred pages, containing information about the Jews not only in the United States but also in European countries. The Jewish population of the world is given as 15,393,815, of whom 10,893,000 are in Europe. The largest Jewish population in any country is that of Poland—3,716,000. That of the United States—3,300,000—comes next, and that in the Ukraine—2,375,000—is third. In Germany the number is 540,000 and in Great Britain only 286,500. In Palestine there are only 81,000. More than one hundred pages of the Year Book are occupied with the names and designations of 1700 Jews of prominence in the United States. The Jewish Publication Society, we are told, has issued more than one hundred and twenty authoritative books on Jewish history, religion, literature, and thought.

In the modest volume of ten *Addresses, Biographical and Historical* (The Lindsey Press ; 5s. net), by Alexander Gordon, M.A., sometime Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Manchester, we have a series of stimulating and graphic narratives of notable men and events in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Mr. Gordon was for nearly a dozen years Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary College in Manchester, and most of these addresses were delivered to the students at the opening of Sessions of the College. They bear no marked sectarian stamp. The study of Philip Doddridge is one of the best examples of Mr. Gordon's gifts of vivid portraiture and warm and sympathetic treatment.

A good book for Lent is the Rev. Peter Green's

Personal Religion and Public Righteousness (Longmans ; 2s. 6d. net), which is commended by the Bishop of London. Its main theme is, 'What the world needs to-day is God. Hence a man's first and highest duty is to seek God, and the most truly *social* thing he can do is to be truly religious, and his most unselfish work is the care of his own soul'—not popular doctrine nowadays, but Canon Green is right.

The Rev. A. T. Palmer has written a very living book on present-day religious needs. He calls it *Vital Verities* (Marshall Brothers ; 6s.). It deals with 'burning questions' in an earnest and capable manner. What are the primal forces for the uplifting of humanity? What kind of Church will win the people? How can we get into touch with the crowd? What solution can we find for the gigantic evil—drink? are some of Mr. Palmer's questions, and to the answer he brings wide reading and a fervent faith. He relies too much, perhaps, on others. The book is largely made up of quotations, but the quotations are his own; they are fresh and pointed, and any one who wishes to deck out his own words with the colours of more vivid passages will find enough material at his disposal in Mr. Palmer's volume.

Prayer in Experience, by Rev. Dugald Butler, D.D. (Marshall Brothers ; 7s. 6d. net), is not a treatise on prayer. It is biographical in form and contains a wealth of illustrations, drawn from widely different sources, of the place of prayer in the life, thought, and work of Christendom. Nearly two hundred names appear in the table of contents, which begins with Polycarp and ends with Henry Drummond. Obviously the references to many of these are very brief, and it might have been more profitable to have had fewer names with a fuller study of each. On the other hand, as the reader passes down the Christian centuries, and finds Romanist and Protestant, mystic and man of affairs, theologian and scientist, all alike witnessing to the power and necessity of prayer, a deep impression is produced of the communion of saints and the oneness of Christian experience. 'Each personality has something fresh to express in his or her own way as a witness to the communion of spirit. Yet all have experienced the same thing. God is waiting to communicate Himself to a willing people. His spirit is everywhere present.' Dr. Butler believes that 'the pressing need of the world to-day is a return to God,' and it may well be that these glimpses of the saints at prayer will be felt by many to be more convincing and persuasive than any more formal argument would be.

The Dynamic of the Cross, by Mr. Richard Voisin F.R.C.V.S. (Marshall Brothers ; 1s. net), contains the substance of a series of Bible readings given at the Friends' Meeting House, Jersey, with the help of a large blackboard diagram. The tone is reverent and the treatment is scriptural in the most literal sense. The writer makes a confident claim of writing under the guidance and for the glory of 'Him Who, through His Divine Spirit, not only put the messages into my heart in the first place, but also gave me in my waking moments the every detail of the diagram which appears as a frontispiece in this booklet.'

It has been said that the doctrine of the Second Coming divides people into three classes—those to whom it is everything, those to whom it is nothing, and those to whom it is something. Most of us belong to the third class. We should put in the first class the writer of a new essay on this theme: *The Shout of a King,* by H. W. Sykes (Marshall Brothers ; 3s. 6d.). There is tremendous insistence on the supreme importance of this truth. There are the familiar quotations of passages which are supposed to describe the conditions of the present day as signs of the impending advent. There is the traditional literalism in the attitude to Scripture. And, finally, there is the weird conception of large parts of the Bible as a programme of future history. All this is presented not only with earnestness and passionate conviction but with a great deal of ability.

The Methodist Year Book, 1923, published by the American Methodist Episcopal Church (Methodist Book Concern ; 50c.) has reached its ninetieth issue. A Scottish Churchman might describe it as a cross between the Church and University Almanac and a General Assembly Blue Book. But it has a freshness all its own, and contains the record of a wonderful variety of Church activities. Of special interest is the account given of the Goodwill Industries which are 'saving waste humanity by conserving the material waste of society.' There are nearly half a million regular contributors of

waste materials, whereby work is provided for 'the destitute and old and handicapped,' and the income from sales approaches a million dollars per annum.

The National Adult School Union has sent out its Lesson Handbook for 1923 under the title of *The Unfolding Purpose* (1s. 3d. net). It is a scheme of study for Adult Schools. It centres on the Person of Christ, and is well thought out as a syllabus. The notes are full and competent, and the book is one well calculated to fulfil its end.

It is some years now since Dr. Charles Jerdan has published any of those addresses to young people for which he is so justly noted. His two most recent books have been a volume of sermons for adults, and a volume of clerical stories and reminiscences. But in *The One Saving Name* (Oliphants; 5s. net) he goes back to children's sermons. These sermons are full of gospel truth, and though they contain fewer anecdotes than the earlier ones they are never dull.

The Epistle to the Galatians, by Mr. C. F. Hogg and Mr. W. E. Vine, M.A. (Pickering & Inglis; 6s. net), is a very readable commentary. It is designed for students who have no knowledge of the original, yet it gives a careful and scholarly discussion of the language of the Epistle, printing the Greek words in English characters. Simple explanations are given of the main problems of criticism and interpretation. The writers show themselves acquainted with the best literature, and their work may be commended.

The Spiritual Messages of the Miracles, by the Rev. George Henry Hubbard (Pilgrim Press; $2), is a series of expositions in which the writer, setting aside all questions of criticism and historicity, expounds the moral and spiritual teaching of the gospel miracles. The introductory chapter, entitled 'Wheat and Chaff,' contains a vehement protest against the undue prominence often given to the details of criticism. One cannot help feeling some sympathy with this protest when one remembers certain commentaries, weighted with learning, but with nothing in them that would feed the soul of a sparrow. But Mr. Hubbard goes to unwarrantable lengths in his contempt for the historical element. For example, dealing with the blasting of the fig-tree, he says, 'The husk of the miracle, *i.e.*, the narrative itself, is beset with difficulties. It abounds in what an old Scotch friend of mine was wont to call "kittled (*sic*) points." Is the story credible in itself? Is it not a contradiction of the spirit and teaching of Jesus? . . . But why answer these questions at all? They concern only the husk, and in no way affect the quality and value of the kernel.' Mr. Hubbard has the hardihood to apply this mode of treatment to the gospel stories of the Resurrection. 'As mere literary or religious products, these stories, wonderful though they be, are after all only gospel chaff. In themselves they represent no spiritual value, they afford no soul nourishment. Even the question of their absolute historical truthfulness is not of great importance.' This airy manner of dismissing historical difficulties would be specially irritating to any sincerely inquiring mind from the fact that the writer, throughout his whole exposition, obviously takes for granted the historical accuracy of the narratives. It is evident that Mr. Hubbard has not thought deeply on what is involved in the fact of a revelation of God in history. Apart from this, his expositions are full of sound Christian teaching and excellent sermon matter.

Thomas Lake Harris and his Occult Teaching, by Mr. W. P. Swainson (Rider; 2s. net), is a booklet giving some account of an American mystic whose teaching was so occult as to appear arrant nonsense to the ordinary mind. To be told that the moon originally 'was an old woman who had seen trouble' is not edifying, even though the statement is made on the authority of an Adept of the old Silver Age. Harris had a small following who were much perturbed when he died. However, they regained their spirits on reflecting that doubtless he had 'progressed far on the road towards transcending physical decease, though he never fully accomplished it.' In other words, he almost escaped death, but not quite.

In *Life's Practical Philosophy* (Rider; 4s. 6d. net) Mr. Charles Wase says much that would be very valuable and suggestive towards guiding his reader to becoming 'an expression of real Power,' if only human nature were other than it is. Mr. Wase makes man his own saviour. It has been tried before. It never works.

Three Sermons on Agnosticism, the Unjust Steward,

and the Labourers in the Vineyard (Scott ; 1s. 6d. net), by the Rev. W. Benson, M.A., Vicar of Leaton, Salop, are so good that one wonders why there are not three times the number equally good.

Nietzsche regarded the Sermon on the Mount as rubbish and sheer evil. Dr. A. W. Robinson, the Canon of Canterbury, does not agree with him, but, on the contrary, finds in it the 'remedy for the "reduced Christianity" from which we are suffering,' with its 'lowering of the pulse of the will to worship,' its 'general slowness to volunteer for tasks of spiritual adventure,' and its 'readiness to be content with compromises where there ought to be courageous decision.' Accordingly, under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement, he has issued *Studies in the Teaching of the Sermon on the Mount* (3s. 6d. net), which consists of eight short talks, each followed by an abundance of notes or, rather, apposite quotations. The little book is characterized by a winning simplicity, by sanity of judgment, and by absolute sincerity. It is as if a wise and kindly man were talking to one on the central things beside his study fire quite naturally, without any strain.

A series of new missionary biographies has been undertaken by the United Council for Missionary Education. The aim of the series is not to add new facts to those already known—it makes no pretence of this—but to give a fresh interpretation of the life and work of great missionaries.

Miss Constance E. Padwick has written the first volume, and if later ones are equal to it the series should prove successful. It is a Life of *Henry Martyn* (S.C.M. ; 5s. net) based on his own 'Journal,' Sargent's biography published in 1816, and Dr. George Smith's published in 1892. Henry Martyn was a great scholar, a great lover, and a great adventurer for God, and it is good to have his story retold.

A Sequel to the Wilderness-Temptation.

A STUDY OF ST. MARK iii. 20–35.

By the Reverend A. D. Martin, Chelmsford.

I.

Concerning our Lord's Temptation in the wilderness certain things may be assumed as generally accepted by Christian people to-day, while there are others which we may advance as equally true if less generally recognized.

(1) The narratives recording the Temptation (Mt 4^{1-11}, Lk 4^{1-13}) must be based upon an account of the experience of Jesus given by Himself. (2) The literary form of these narratives is that of the parable. All that happened lay within His own soul, in His prolonged vigil and meditation upon the work He had undertaken. (3) The three suggestions of the devil express one persistent solicitation, just as, later, the one motive of the Lord's evangelic work is expressed in the three parables of Lk 15, concerning treasures lost and found. (4) This one solicitation is that Jesus should seek the fulfilment of His vocation by directly employing worldly power and by appealing to worldly instincts in man. The *dénouement* of the Temptation lies in the last,[1] the frontal assault, free of all disguise, 'All the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship *me*.' (5) The Temptation was real. It concerned His great longing to set up better conditions of life. And—

> Most dangerous
> Is that temptation that doth goad us on
> To sin in loving virtue.[2]

In some management of the circumstances in which He was placed, circumstances to us now unknown—was Simon the Zealot a factor in them?—Jesus was tempted to do the thing Satan willed. And He 'suffered being tempted' (He 2^{18}). Christian people have often failed to appreciate this reality of the Temptation. But what may appear to mildly spiritual persons no very searching ordeal was, in fact, something which shook the nature of Jesus to its foundations. He triumphed,

[1] Following St. Matthew's order.
[2] *Measure for Measure*, ii. 2.

but not without battle. We must add that the *point d'appui* for the Evil One lay in the masterful strength of Jesus, His fullness of natural human life—rich in blood, iron in physique, with continuous mental surge and energy, and instinct of command. It was not a temptation which could come to a *feebly* good man. Later in history, Mohammed succumbed to it, and Mohammed was no weakling. Our Lord had an unfaltering will. There was in Him, too, a capacity for anger. He did not need the exhortation of the Psalmist, as the quietists have often done, 'Ye that love the Lord, hate evil' (Ps 97^{10}). 'There is much truth,' says Dr. Forsyth, 'in Keim's treatment of Christ's temperament as the choleric.' [1]

How far Jesus could go in the direction in which for Him temptation lay, is shown by the narratives of the Cleansing of the Temple. In the interests of pacifism the scene described in these passages has been unwarrantably toned down. Honestly we cannot divest it of anger. A placid man would never have knotted 'a scourge of cords' (Jn 2^{15}), and it is less natural to think of His inflicting alarm and pain upon inoffensive cattle, than of His applying those cords to shoulders that richly deserved them. He stopped when He did, because His indignation had swept Him up to the very frontiers that delimit the rival kingdoms of God and the World. Before Him lay that dominion of Satan, the world of the Force-Empires, into which He was ever being urged to go. Of the Wilderness-Temptation it is said, 'for a season' (Lk 4^{13}) the devil left Him. We may be sure he came back again. Indeed, right on to the end this central temptation beset Jesus (Lk 22^{28}, Jn 14^{30}). And those ten minutes of the Temple-cleansing were plainly more critical for character than all the forty days in the wilderness. While Jesus knotted His scourge, Satan held his breath and even reached out his hand to beflag the gates of Hell. But,

> 'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
> Another thing to fall.' [2]

Jesus did NOT sin.

II.

On a day when the Master was at His gentlest and holiest work fell a strange sequel to the Wilderness-Temptation. He was teaching and healing crowds of poor folk, His heart filled with a great compassion. Hour after hour sped by and still the people thronged, and 'He could not so much as eat bread.' His marvellous staying power upheld Him, but disciples tired. So far as numbers went, His mission was proving a great success. And the eyes of all Israel had begun to centre upon this energetic Figure. A first hint of what was to be said about Him that day came when His friends, 'went out to lay hold on him.' They declared 'He is beside himself.' To us that reads as a shocking statement. One has to remember, however, that in Syria mental derangement has often been regarded as a sign of inspiration.[3] The Spirit of Yahweh was credited sometimes with strange actions. When Elijah mysteriously disappeared, the young prophets of Jericho conceived that that Spirit might have taken him up and cast him upon some mountain, or into some valley (2 K 2^{16}). Not unkind criticism but superstitious anxiety animated the friends of Jesus.

Worse, however, was to follow. There arrived a deputation of scribes from the Temple in Jerusalem. These were men utterly unlike the simple folk whom Jesus had around Him. They were dialectical, clever men, and, coming from the headquarters of the Faith, they were greeted with deference by all. Then, to the horror of His disciples, *these official persons accused Jesus of having done the very thing which, as a matter of fact, He had been tempted to do.* They said, He *had* made a compact with the Evil One.

The accusation jarred tremendously. That Jesus felt and saw a startling connexion between the Wilderness-conflict and this scribal verdict about Him is clear from His words, 'No one can enter into the house of the strong man, and spoil his goods, *except he first bind the strong man.*' As He spoke, there rushed back upon Jesus the hour of that earlier battle. Had He made a compact with Satan? It was the thing which, in effect, He had been tempted to do—not, indeed, at first nakedly, yet subtly and essentially. But these men lied. He had thrust the Tempter back.

He was terribly moved. Would not you feel moved if you had come faintly, though victoriously, through a most searching temptation in the recesses of your own soul, and then found yourself

[1] *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 7.
[2] *Measure for Measure*, ii. 1.
[3] Cf. Hos 9^{7}, also Curtis's *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, pp. 150–151, and THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiii. 151.

accused of having done the very thing which, not without effort, you had thrust away as a thing undivine, nay, finally, diabolic? It was as though these ferret-eyed scribes had been mysteriously witnessing conflicts which Jesus had never dreamed any earthly being could know about. They travestied the course of His thoughts, and rankly falsified the issue. But how terrible it all was! Even in its English dress, St. Mark's record reads like the story of a palpitation. In the Master's answer there is reasoning, and there is a certain progress of thought and feeling. His first words, 'How can Satan cast out Satan?' cogent as they are, do not touch the matter to the quick as His last words do. The sentences seem to distil slowly from the alembic of a high but startled mood. Drop by drop they fall, and the last is the pure spirit of judgment. 'Verily I say unto you, All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.'

When He had finished all His teaching that day, and there gathered to Him the Twelve Apostles deeply indignant over the accusation of the scribes, Jesus told them what the facts behind the scenes of His ministry really had been, told them the parable of the Wilderness-conflict very much as it lies before us to-day.

III.

The sequel to the Temptation raises an important question. Was it accident only that Jesus was accused of this traffic with Satan? Wherein consists the actual significance of the charge?

Now from time to time God sends into the world certain elect persons who impress us as being not ordinary people. We acknowledge in them a personal magnetism, an indefinable distinction. For tens of thousands of people the late Lord Kitchener possessed that quality—a quality of lonely greatness, of reserve, of command. As is usual in such cases, there are those to whom it is but 'the Kitchener legend,' but Sir George Arthur's biography is of a great man. Mr. Rudyard Kipling has told us, in his poem 'Kitchener's School,' how to the Mohammedan it seemed, 'Certainly also Kitchener is mad,' and this just because of the magnanimity of Kitchener in serving those he conquered. He was mad, 'beside himself.' Al through his public career a mystery of greatness was gathering about the man. Hence the verdict of the Eastern.

Take another type. There have been men in the Christian Church in whom eminent talents have been developed by deep communion with God. As the years pass, there shines from them a quality of goodness which inspires us with awe. When they speak, their unfolding mind is lit with the sheen of God. They seem not of this world. One who heard the late Dr. Alexander McLaren in his old age address a big meeting in Edinburgh, said that, as he spoke and men listened, they looked, and '*it was like seeing a spirit.*'[1]

Such as these suggest to us somewhat the aspect of Jesus in His Galilean ministry. He was a Presence not to be put by. Men looked and looked again. His passing down the streets of Capernaum lit them with 'the light that never was on sea or land.' And as sicknesses melted away before Him, and words mighty, new, piercing, fell from His lips, the spell of another world was laid upon human judgment. What was it—this distinction? 'What manner of man is this?' was often asked.

The verdict of the scribes was the answer of men who instinctively recoiled from His teaching, but it was not a common answer. It was in line with the verdict of His friends. Terrible as the Scribal charge was, it recognized the fact that here was more than a common personality. Here was something awful, transcendent, cosmic. We have to remember that in those days people did not joke about Satan. They felt and dreaded the unseen Evil Power as something gigantic, able to cast shadows over human life deep as the mountains are high. So it was not a scornful or derisive thing the Scribes said, but a thing uttered with some feeling of the reality of a world of spirit. And it did testify to this that in Jesus was a spirit non-earthly, and terrible in the range of its power. As they said it, the Scribes shrank back from Him. We read He had to 'call them unto him' (v.[23]), as one calls sullen and frightened children.

The Christian Church has busied itself with many Christologies, and we can learn from them all. But still the Figure of Jesus towers above us unmeasured, perhaps immeasurable. This, indeed,

[1] *Dr. McLaren of Manchester*, p. 189.

would seem to be the judgment of many of our best minds. On the closing pages of his book, *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* Professor Loofs declares, 'It would be attempting impossible things if we tried to understand the historical person of Christ' (p. 240). We remember, too, that He Himself said, '*No one knoweth the Son save the Father*' (Mt 11^{27}).

One thing, however, qualifies our nescience. His friends, as they approached Him a second time on that day of high momentous feeling, furnished the occasion for the one saying of His which takes the light of the mystery and brings it a little nearer to human eyes. His answer to their message was to look round about Him upon His disciples and to say, 'Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.' Now, if it is possible by doing the Will of God to become a brother of Jesus, then, whatever mystery of greatness invests Him begins to invest us also. And does not that conclusion enable us to understand all we need to know about the Divine in Him?

One of the better thoughts of our modern theology is that of a progressive Incarnation. There must be degrees in any human possession of the Divine. 'It should be remembered,' says Dr. Forsyth, 'that human personality is not a ready-made thing, but it has to grow by moral exercise, and chiefly, in the Kingdom of God, by prayer. The living soul has to grow into moral personality. And this should not be ignored in connexion with the moral psychology of Christ. He no more than we came into the world with a completed personality—which would be not so much a miracle but a magic and a prodigy.'[1] Step by step, as He did the Will of God, the Divine was realized in Him. And it is His own word that tells us we too, by this same practice of that Will, become partakers of the 'mystery of godliness.' The light of far-off worlds, the glory and spaciousness of the unnumbered ages, gather about even plain men and women who walk as Jesus walked. Why need we strain our minds by vain endeavours to find a credal measure for Jesus? Is it not enough that if we do the Will of God, the same cosmic glory, the life which is more than words can express, makes us as our Lord, and that thus, 'as he is, even so are we in this world'?[2]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 340. [2] 1 Jn 4^{17}.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Paulus' Interpretation of 'Christ.'[1]

GERMAN books since the war have notoriously been hard to come by, for financial, postal, and fiscal reasons. This volume by Paulus, however, is worth an effort. It represents some of the best contemporary Christian thinking on the Continent and forms one more index of the recent return to philosophy on the part of theologians—a movement that we may be sure is not temporary. The author's own excellent summaries may guide us to the significance of his crowded and thoroughly well-informed book. It is one needed corrective to Schweitzer.

In the first part he argues that New Testament faith does not revolve round the earthly life of Jesus, much less 'the historic Jesus' in our technical sense of that phrase. Essentially it depends on present fellowship with the heavenly or spiritual Christ, meaning by 'Christ' what far transcends recorded historical phenomena. On the other hand, this Christ-faith or Christ-piety is unintelligible apart from the known figure of Jesus as He actually lived. Without such concrete records, without the connexion thereby established with Old Testament prophetic faith, Christianity could not long have preserved its original and special character in competition with the Mystery-cults.

The ancient Christology, further, attempted vainly to equate the eternal Logos with a historical individual. But it bore permanently valuable witness to the transcendence and universality of the Logos, as also to the crucial fact that the Logos had really been manifested in human history. Whether in worship or in mystic contemplation or in the heartfelt faith of the simplest believer, Christ has always meant God as present to man,

[1] *Der Christusproblem der Gegenwart.* By Lic. Rudolf Paulus. Tübingen: Mohr, 1922. Pp. xvi, 182.

as drawing near to us personally. And it is a God whose features are the features of Jesus.

When we survey modern Christology, it is seen to oscillate constantly between the two extremes of 'rationalism' and 'historism' (*i.e.* the view that our deepest problems must be solved by scientific historical research or not at all). Rationalism takes 'Christ' as a mere idea, scouts history, and develops no driving power; historism takes 'Christ' as an exclusively human figure, ignores the eternal or timeless range of faith, and can do little to justify its own claim to truth. Besides, the attempt to base faith in God on Jesus as a historical person is rendered nugatory by the implications of the modern historical method.

We must, therefore, seek to overcome the defects of both theories by a more intimate combination of Idea and History. The theoretical solution is to be sought by following out still further the principles of German Idealism in its progress from Leibnitz to Hegel and Schleiermacher. In practice, we must simply accept the guidance of New Testament faith. There 'Jesus' and 'Christ' are not stiffly identified, but act and react upon each other in the movement of fresh, creative life.

To the general contention of Paulus that in our theorized thought of Jesus Christ both historical knowledge and speculation have a part, there can be nothing to object. But it is doubtful whether 'Christ,' a term which received its constitutive meaning from 'Messiah,' is a genuinely helpful name for the timeless and transcendent aspect of our Lord. Logos or Holy Spirit, surely, is nearer the mark. Attention should be drawn to an able and sympathetic study of Herrmann's argument that the intuitive apprehension of Jesus' inner life liberates us from bondage to, or dependence on, the conclusions of historical criticism. Apparently Paulus would hold that the historian as such has the right to pronounce on *everything* in Jesus, His inner life too; but this is a quite untenable position. Motives, to say no more, are inscrutable for science of any kind, as in the personal relations of friendship we rightly assume. Paulus' later admission that historical research after all grasps no more than an aspect, or aspects, of reality is equivalent to the abandonment of his earlier position.

Now for the second half of the book. Here it is contended that what belief in Christ does for our belief in God is not to create it, but to impart to it depth and inwardness. It gives the assurance that God is with us to break sinful bondage and bestow His fellowship; 'Christ' means just this redemptive approach of the Eternal. Therefore the Church is 'Christ's' body, the new life of God's children embraced in His. Similarly, when it is said that Christ suffered, died, and rose again, these words indicate not merely events that happened, but permanent forms or expressions of the Christ-life. Theism and Mysticism embody particular aspects of the profound and basal mystery of religion; the thought of 'Christ' contains the whole. 'Christ,' accordingly, stands for two sorts of truth—one super-historical, the other historical and concrete. The first guarantees the truth of faith, the second its power; the first makes Christianity a world-religion, the second gathers Christian people in a church. Of course the two points of view can only be distinguished, not separated; for in life they are one.

Jesus is *par excellence* the Bearer and Embodiment of the Christ-life. Historically conditioned as we must think Him, He is inseparable from the gospel He proclaimed, and partakes in the eternal truth of Divine self-bestowal, and thus in the absolute life or being of God.

It is clear that Paulus is vigorously and intensely occupied with the familiar problem: Can we place the Mediator in a larger and (so to say) universal or unconditionally valid framework of ideas? Can we see Jesus as the illustration of ideas greater and more comprehensive than Himself? A venturous proposal, yet of perennial fascination! Thus, when Paulus more than once recurs to the point that the essence of the Redemptive Idea cannot be confined in a single individual, he is not siding with Strauss, though Strauss said much the same; he is trying to reach what others have expressed by the term Logos, or Spirit. Yet the fate of Biedermann's distinctions might have warned him off. The knife-edge he is treading is too narrow. We may lose Jesus all over again if we insist on placing Him in His exact philosophic niche, or surrounding Him with an impersonal penumbra which we choose to designate 'Christ.' Is 'Christ' a person? Then the name 'God' is better. Is 'Christ' a principle? Why, then, hypostatize it otiosely? The believing mind is justly suspicious of all talk of 'principles,' described as though they were self-existent abstractions, in forgetfulness of the fact that they have

no meaning apart from personal experience, God's or man's. I cannot myself see how Paulus, working on his special methods, can avoid delimiting the significance of Jesus *a priori*. And to say 'Christ-history' when you mean the whole story of God's redeeming work for man does not in the long run foster lucidity.

Yet so powerful a thinker makes a contribution. He knits up afresh the bonds between Theism and specifically Christian thought; and this is much. He forces historical research to consider that it cannot turn itself, straight off, into a self-sufficient philosophy. Also he carries on and enriches Troeltsch's imposing and suggestive argument about relative and absolute elements in history. Everything that makes the idea of history ever so little clearer merits a welcome in this confused age.

H. R. Mackintosh.

New College, Edinburgh.

A Veteran Church Historian.

Professor Karl Müller of Tübingen has seen his seventieth birthday, and a number of his most distinguished German colleagues have marked the occasion by contributing papers to a volume dedicated to him—*Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden Karl Müller* (Tübingen: 1922, pp. 351). In their name Professor Scheel congratulates Müller and bears eloquent testimony to his services to the science of ecclesiastical history. Müller, indeed, was one of the most worthy pioneers in making Church History a science. That, perhaps, is his greatest merit, although his numerous scholarly contributions to our knowledge of the subject are in themselves of no inconsiderable worth. To judge by the portrait which constitutes the frontispiece to this volume, Müller carries his years well, and his work should not nearly all be done yet.

The book consists of twenty-one essays, all on minor but interesting points, and most of them seem to be of real value. Harnack writes on 'Peter in the Judgment of Enemies of the Church in Antiquity.' The material is scanty, but suffices to cast light from this odd angle upon the primacy of the Apostle. Kattenbusch also treats of 'The Pre-eminence of Peter' in conjunction with 'The Character of the *Urgemeinde* in Jerusalem'—one of the most valuable studies in the book. Loofs investigates afresh the question raised long since, and never solved, What did the Council of Nicæa understand by the term *homoousios*? His view is that the word is ambiguous, and was deliberately adopted on that very account.

Holmquist writes what is to us a most informative and interesting article on 'Church and State in Evangelical Sweden.' We cannot mention all. All are good as the occasion demanded.

W. D. Niven.

Aberdeen.

French Theology.

The number of Dr. Piepenbring's books is mounting up, but 'The Historical Jesus' is not a new one, only a second edition altogether reconstructed and enlarged.[1] The clarity of the French mind is always deceptive, has a happy knack of concealing under an engaging simplicity what is really very masterly. But here the starting-point and outlook seem familiar. The first Christians, it appears, were so absorbed in watching for their Lord that they thought of Him almost exclusively as glorified, and ready to return; had small place in their minds for His earthly life and ministry; and when, slowly convinced that the end of things was further off than they had imagined, they turned back to these to write them down, they already saw them through the splendour of the other thinking. The Gospels, even Mark and the Logia, are not pure history, but that coloured and altered by theological presuppositions. Like the recurring burden of a song, the phrase, this is mere Paulinism, rules out many things—the Lord's Supper as we know it, the foretellings of His death, all thought of expiation, such titles as Christ and the Son of God; above all, faith in Christ in the sense of the Epistles, and much else. When these intrusions are removed, what is the Figure that is left to us; the real Jesus, as they knew and saw Him? A youth grows up in Galilee, much influenced by the better side of Pharisaism, and with a mind that naturally fastened on such parts of the Scriptures as speak of God's affection and compassion, which, later, were to become the centre of gravity of His own teaching; He is attracted to John and is baptized by him, though not having to repent of His sins 'in the same

[1] *Jésus Historique*, par C. Piepenbring: deuxième édition entièrement refondue (Librairie Istra 7 fr. 50).

degree as others.' On hearing of the Baptist's death, He feels compelled to carry on his work, almost wholly in Galilee, and with no thought except that of proclaiming the near approach of the Kingdom of God, which He conceives as a world-wide Jewish theocratic State, into which the Gentiles will flock of themselves: as a world entirely changed and glorified, for the conditions of entrance to the Kingdom are repentance and a new loving way of living; and nobody who is prepared to accept that is, or can be, excluded. Moreover, Jesus regards Himself as He who will one day come as the Messiah. Under the pressure of events His views change and are modified. He is forced to the conclusion the elect are few; and, while retaining His belief in God's compassion, speaks gravely, after the method of the faith in which He had been brought up, of justice and judgment, feeling no need to reconcile these two sides of His thought. But He is still sure that the Kingdom, which is to come by direct Divine interposition, is at the door; goes up to Jerusalem not to die, but because He feels the glorious end is nearing, has no thought of the Cross, really fears an assassin's dagger and takes steps to safeguard Himself against that, is crucified; and those with their minds in the fit state for that see visions of Him, though these visions did not cause their faith, but that faith the visions. That really is all. Evidently, if this be so, the Gospels cannot be relied upon at almost any point, and Christ is a much smaller figure than we had imagined. But what bewilders one is the last section of the book, where the originality and supremacy of our Lord's teaching are discussed, and maintained, as against what the author conceives to be its two serious rivals, Laotze and Epictetus. Obviously he is a little obsessed by Grill on the one hand, and Bonhoeffer on the other; and on the Chinese sage he sometimes speaks with a queer assurance where many talk humbly and with hesitation. Still one cannot but admire the full-hearted enthusiasm that he heaps on these two master spirits, especially on Laotze, whom he regards upon the whole as far and away, our Lord apart, the greatest spiritual figure of the race, with a catholicity of mind, he thinks, that makes Paul and the Christian Church look mean and shabby, though there is no gospel like Christ's gospel. But what amazes one is that the author himself has not seen the sudden and complete change of method and mental attitude in the two sections of his work. Here he is stretching language, not perhaps unduly (one feels that his sympathy with them is likely to result in real understanding of these masters), but to its farthest, eagerly seeing in it the best and most it can contain. Whereas when dealing with the Gospels he is paring to the quick, and ruling out, and challenging in the most ruthless way. Evidently Dr. Piepenbring is a nice man to have as an opponent, but is much less certain as a friend.

Professor Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., has issued the first large volume [1] (pp. 515) of a huge undertaking possible only to an erudite and indefatigable mind. He has set himself to a close and minute examination of the history and methods of the comparative study of religion, and has thrown his net so wide as to include everything down the ages that can reasonably fall under that ample title. The framework of the book is built on an imposing scale, yet it is filled in with extraordinary thoroughness. Beginning with the old Greek philosophical schools and other non-Christian writers, such as Plutarch, who, one is glad to note from several indications, seems to be recovering the position he once held, but has long largely lost, it passes to Gnosticism, Manichæism, Neo-Platonism and the like, and the Church's treatment of them. The Middle Ages furnish a vivid chapter, what with the impinging on the faith of Jewish and especially Mohammedan thought, and the speculations of the scholastic theologians on the theory of religious knowledge, a very vital question in their day; and, much less frequently, on the evolution of humanity, and of the Church. The Renaissance with its rehabilitation of paganism, and its tendency to give an equal value, or nearly so, to all the outstanding religions; the Reformation, running out into a new zeal for Biblical archæology and the discussion of the origins of many rites and customs of the Roman Catholic system and the like; rationalism, with its inquiries into fetichism and animism and much else: the opening up of the unknown world, the Jesuit missionaries and their attitude to the native faiths, the romantic discovery and the beginnings of the study of the Eastern scriptures, the several schools of historians with their various readings and interpretations of the facts of the long past; Ritschl, and pragmatism,

[1] *L'Étude Comparée des Religions: Essai critique*, par H. Pinard de la Boullaye (Beauchesne: Paris; 36 fr.).

and modern psychology, such are a few of the subjects that lead up to the final chapters, where the whole immense field of comparative religion, as that term is technically used, is traversed, hurriedly yet fully. Naturally the style is curt and compressed. There is not much room for eloquence upon a sign-post. Yet this is no mere jumbled pile of material heaped confusedly together anyhow, but a real book. What strikes one is the wealth of reading and sheer learning that lies behind every page. Try where you will, you will find nothing omitted. Remember some corner of the subject where you have some claim to exact knowledge, and you will light upon a compact paragraph upon it with footnotes added, full and accurate and up to date. Turn the pages, and you come, here on picturesque figures like Marco Polo or Raymond Lull, and there on a table of years showing how from Baur's day to Harnack's the dates of the Gospels have been pressed back and back; here is a fine study of Averroes, and there a passage on the primitive monotheism held by some to have preceded polytheism in China, and so on endlessly. A main impression left upon the mind is the humbling reflexion that there is nothing new under the sun, that our most original thinking is hoary with antiquity, and the novelties that catch men's excited minds are only faint far-blown echoes of what has been often said hundreds, sometimes thousands, of years ago, that the wheel goes round and round.

> I am like a stream that flows
> Full of the cold springs that arose
> In morning lands, in distant hills;
> And down the plain my channel fills
> With meltings of forgotten snows.

Is it all then only a scurrying of white mice in a cage, up and back and round once more, with no real progress or advance, in spite of all the rush and noise and pother? Our author is quite sure it is not so. As yet the study of comparative religion is in its infancy, but it is sufficiently far advanced, he thinks, for one to fashion a method, compounded out of hints from all the schools, which will be really scientific, and the formulating of that is the purpose of his second volume. It is an audacious adventure, but the study ought to prove a fascinating and informing one.

ARTHUR J. GOSSIP.

Aberdeen.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Clean.[1]

'Ye shall be clean.'—Ezk 36[25].

THE other day I read a sad thing. You know how beautiful the sea birds are, the gulls, the kittiwakes, the guillemots, and all the rest of them; how they glint and gleam when the sun strikes on them; how easily they wheel and turn and bank and dip and dive and right themselves, far more cleverly than any airman can; how clean they are, and pure and white. God means them to be that, and they keep themselves spotless, can't be happy if they are soiled.

And yet all round the coast of England, east and south and west, they are having a pitiful time, so I am told. Many vessels use oil nowadays, and let the waste and dirty oil out into the sea—a horrid, sticky, smelly, messy mass it is. And it seems that the birds lighting on the water, or darting at a fish, often land in this nastiness and can hardly struggle to shore, for it glues their wings, it mats their feathers, it covers them all over with a horrible greasy dirtiness; and though they work at it continually, preening themselves all day, it won't come off. And the poor birds, meant to be clean, and longing to be clean, but coated with that disgusting foulness, pine and droop and die—thousands and thousands of them, so they say, all round the coast.

Well, you and I are like these birds. We too are meant to be clean. God made us for that. And yet there is a horrid, sticky, greasy nastiness, called sin; and if we get any of that on us, we'll just be miserable; for it won't come off, and it is so messy and foul and horrible. And we can't be really happy unless we are clean.

I know quite well that there is a healthy kind of grubbiness that you like; can't understand why

[1] By the Reverend Arthur J. Gossip.

Mother has a craze for sending you to wash your hands, when they seem to yourself to look quite decent; and why she is so fussy over tide-marks left on your wrists and neck, or up under your hair. When some one calls that you must see, and you are sent for from your games, and scrubbed till your face shines, and have your hair brushed so hard and straight and plastered down that it looks as if it were painted on your head, like a doll's, and get a clean hard collar on, you just hate it, you don't recognize yourself, you seem quite strange and queer. And when you get out again, back to cricket or footer, and your hair is rumpled, and your collar is all crumply, and your face is streaked again—ah! that's better! Yes, I know. And yet—honest injun, isn't it lovely to have a wash after a hard game or a long walk? And you wee ones are never really quite as comfy and cosy—now are you?—as when you are bathed and clean and ready for bed. It's comfy to be clean. Our bodies feel that. And so do our hearts inside. They too know it's comfy to be clean, and horrid to be dirty. You remember the other day you said what wasn't just quite true, and you have been unhappy about it ever since, feel mean and soiled and grubby, wish you weren't, that you could get the dirt away. But it's oily stuff, and it sticks. Or you made rather a fool of yourself when they ran you out. Perhaps you weren't run out, but it was silly to lose your temper, and argue and sulk and get quite hot and angry over it. And now you wish you hadn't, are almost ashamed to meet the other fellows. It's not nice to be dirty, and sin is so very dirty and greasy and unclean. We can never be happy, any more than the poor birds, so long as we are like that.

Well, what are we to do?—we and they? The filthy stuff sticks fast. They preen themselves and work at it all day, but it's no use. And so do we, but we can't get clean either. A man in the Bible, looking at us, feels disgusted at such dirty people, and cries in a shuddering kind of way, 'Wash you, make you clean.' But we can't. Look at these poor birds labouring so hard all day long, yet it's no use. And we've tried too; tried to get rid of that quick temper, of our grabbing, selfish ways, of our funkiness when we are in a hole, and there's likely to be trouble. But we are all coated over with it, and it has sunk right in, and we can't get clean. It's like trying to wash off oil with no soap; it's worse than that, says a man in the Bible, for though you take much soap it will still stick, do what you can. We are like poor Topsy, the wee black lassie, who kept scrubbing at her face, but it would never come white. Another man in the Bible knew that well: pictures us all standing pretty wretchedly in filthy clothes, all mud and dirt. If only we could get them off, and be done with them, and be clean! I remember a man like that at the Front. In an advance he had got into one of these horrid cesspool kind of things they have in French farmyards, right into it, almost to the waist. And there was he all day, wet and smelly, foul, and very much ashamed—much more worried about being so dirty than about all the shells, and longing until he could get a bath. Perhaps you have felt something like that. Perhaps as a wee chap you fell full length in a muddy road on a wet day, and got up a poor, unhappy, little figure, standing so miserable with mud on your clothes, and mud on your face, and mud in your hair, and mud dripping from your fingers—all spread out. It was so wet and uncomfortable. And yet you could do nothing, needed some one to help you, and, of course, Mother came, wiped your face; and that felt better; and rubbed your hands, and that was fine; and scraped your clothes a bit, and by and by, when they were dry, brushed them, and you would never have known at last that you had had a fall. But you needed Mother to help you to get clean. And we need some one to help us too. And we have some one. In the Testament a poor soul with a dreadful foulness came to Jesus, and said, 'Look at me! If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' And Jesus said, 'I will: be thou clean.' And it came true. And always He was doing that. John tells us that what Christ did for him was that. He washed him—washed him from his sins. He was so sticky and wretched and messy and unhappy, like those miserable birds; he had tried and tried and tried, and couldn't get it off. But Jesus did it for him. And He'll do it for you too.

Think of these birds. If one of them could get rid of the oily nastiness, how happy it would be, clean, free, living its glorious life again up in the sunshine, as God meant that it should do. And wouldn't it be splendid to be done with tempers and sulks, and peevishness and crossness, to be clean and happy as our Father wants us to be? Well, we can, for Christ will help us. There is a lonely grave away up near the Pole, which was at

one time, perhaps still is for all I know, the most northerly grave of which we know. It was a British seaman who died there, one of a Polar expedition, and they buried him yonder far away, with nothing but the great snowfields and unending ice in their pureness round about him, and they set up a little wooden cross, and on it cut this text—'Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.' And if you ask God, He will do it for you too, will make you clean, quite clean.

Are you Infectious?[1]

'It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones. Take heed to yourselves.'—Lk $17^{2.3}$.

The other week a queer thing happened in London that caused quite a big scare for a time. Somebody found a little parcel lying on one of the streets. And when they opened it, they saw it was a lot of small glass tubes, all carefully sealed at the ends; but some of them had got cracked and broken in the fall, and there was oozing out a sticky, messy mass. Well, they took it to the police station, and then things began to happen. For some one was sure that these glass tubes were full of the germs of diseases and illnesses. Oh yes! just as bad as measles and far worse, though you didn't like even that much when you had it—horrible diseases. And here were twenty-one tubes, they said, all full of the beginnings of them, and somebody had spilt them here on the road, and if they hadn't been found in time, anything might have happened, and all London have been in their beds; and whoever had been throwing things like this about the streets (take care there how you handle them or you may get it)—cholera, or plague, or something dreadful. So they said, and there was fuss and talking and excitement till they got them all safely destroyed. And yet, do you know that we are all carrying about with us glass tubes like that, full of really terrible illnesses, and if we aren't very careful we may let them slip and break, and with that the germs will get out, and some one, many people perhaps, may grow badly ill; and all because we were clumsy-fingered or forgetful, and didn't notice we had let them fall. When you had measles (or was it scarlet fever?) you didn't have a happy time. The bed got so hot and crumby and crumply, and you so tired of lying still, of reading, of all your toys, of pretending that the ceiling was a desert island, and the wee bumps in it mountains, and the cracks rivers, and you a shipwrecked sailor on it like Robinson Crusoe, tired of everything and anything. Well, you got measles from some one. He had it, and he passed it on to you. And if you could find him, you would give him a bit of your mind. But he meant no harm; the poor chap didn't know that he was ill when he gave it to you. And you, without meaning it, have likely handed it on to some one else; and when you gave it to that other girl, it was Christmas time, and she lost all the parties and the holiday that had been planned, which was far worse for her than it had been for you. And you did it, not knowing, all because you were infectious. Yes, but we pass on other things as well, worse even than that. We carry about with us glass tubes, and very brittle things they are, easily smashed, and then, oh dear! what have we done? Out fly the germs of ugly horrid things, and everybody round about us seems to take them all at once. There's temper; how easily that glass tube gets cracked! The other day you were playing football, and some one on the other side swerved ever so neatly and got past you and scored right under the posts. And, instead of taking it in good humour, and saying to him, 'Well played! You got me that time, but you won't do it again,' you got cross and lost your head, and started playing roughly, and with that he started too, and soon every one was at it, and the whole game was quite spoiled. All because you let slip that little glass tube and broke it, and out the germs rushed. A boy in a bad temper is dreadfully infectious, and ought to be shut up all by himself, for at least an hour. Or you are a big one at home, don't go to bed with the little ones, but sit up half an hour longer. And because you are big, the wee ones do what you do and think that fine and grown-up. And if you are grabby and selfish and cross, they will be apt to be the very same. If you are always snatching at the best, they will say to themselves they will have to snatch first if they are to have anything; and you will all be snatching, all because you began it, for a selfish person is infectious, and gives selfishness to other people, though he keeps everything else to himself. We must be careful of these glass tubes, you and I, and not leave them lying about to get broken. For look what mischief that can cause! And if you ask, but why ever are there these stupid tubes at all, and

[1] By the Reverend Arthur J. Gossip.

why am I, who can never keep anything (look at my pockets), who am always finding things in the queerest places, and always mislaying my books, and my cap, and my everything, why am I given such a dangerous thing as a temper to keep? Surely they might know I would be screwing off the top to see what's inside; or doing something foolish with it. But it's a very good thing to have these glass tubes full of germs, if they are kept in their right places and used as they should be. For wise men study them, and learn from them how it is folk get ill, and what it is that makes them worse, and how they can help them to get better, and keep them, indeed, from becoming ill at all. And a temper is a fine thing, if we use it properly, and don't let it slip and break. It too will help us to keep from getting ill, and to get better if we do. The Lord Christ was sometimes angry, but only at the proper times and at the proper things. And even selfishness can be very useful, if we use it as we are meant to do, and not in the wrong way we do do. Do to others, says Christ, as you would that they should do to you. Think what you would like done to yourself, and then do that to the new boy at school, or the fellow at the party who seems to be having rather a stale time. Keep it in its tube and use it properly, and it will help. But break and lose it, and there's endless trouble. So we must be upon our guard, says Christ. For it is only when one doesn't know he is infectious, he is likely to give things to some one else. Once he does know, he will surely take care. And now you know you have these brittle tubes to guard, and you will do your best. But indeed they are so dangerous, that I think, perhaps, because we are so stupid and clumsy and so apt to let them slip, we had better do what they did in London, break them all up and be done with them, make a full end of temper and selfishness altogether. Don't you think that's safest, for then we couldn't be infectious and do harm?

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Lamb of God.

'The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'—Jn 1^{29}.

There had been no prophet in Israel for five long centuries. And now suddenly a voice is heard in the wilderness—the voice of a prophet. It made a great impression upon the people. They were struck first of all by his appearance. But they marvelled still more at the things which the prophet said. They quoted his sharp sayings to the Pharisees, to the Roman soldiers, and to others, with delight. And when he preached, no one could be indifferent to his words. The echo of his words has reached down the long centuries to the present day. It was mighty preaching that stirred the hearts of all men, and every one felt that a new day had come to Israel, that a real preacher of righteousness had been found at last.

Who was he, then, this John the Baptist? He had been born in a godly family. His father was one of the priests, and his mother also belonged to a priestly family. What was it that sent him out into the wilderness?

It was a strange thing; it was the sense of sin that drove him there. Nowadays people do not worry so much about their sins. Every generation has produced a host of writers who try to persuade the world that sin is nothing but a trifle; it may be a kind of immaturity, which will be outgrown in time. Dr. Parker has a sufficient answer. 'It could not have been a trifle,' he says, 'that started the great drops of blood from the body of Jesus Christ in Gethsemane, or that caused Him His exceeding sorrow on the tree. Great natures cannot weep blood except on great occasions. There must have been something terrible about this moral putrescence which is called sin. It was no speck on the surface; it was poison in the blood.'

It was the sense of sin that drove John to the wilderness. And what did the wilderness do for him? It brought him face to face with God. We need to be face to face with God to understand what sin is. When its only background is God's holiness and purity, then we see our sin as it really is; we see it in all its hideousness and loathsomeness. And in the loneliness there, he meditated upon the Old Testament revelation, so that it became full of meaning to him. How often he must have read of the suffering Messiah, of One who bears other people's sins, of One who suffers the just for the unjust! 'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.' And so when John saw Jesus coming to him, he recognized Him as the suffering

Messiah, and he cried out, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'

1. Why did John call Jesus the *Lamb* of God? Perhaps it was the time of the Passover and the Paschal lambs were being driven to Jerusalem.

All in the April evening,
April airs were abroad;
The sheep with their little lambs
Passed me by on the road.

The sheep with their little lambs
Passed me by on the road;
All in the April evening
I thought on the Lamb of God.

A lamb is innocent and mild
And merry on the soft green sod,
And Jesus Christ the Undefiled
Is the Lamb of God.

(1) Both to John and to us the first thought the word 'lamb' brings is that of innocence. He who takes away the sin of the world must be Himself without sin. We don't make enough of Christ's sinless life. It's not simply that He is an example offered for our imitation. His sinlessness is the very essence of His life, His sinlessness is Himself. But it is not the innocence of a child that knows nothing of the world. It is the innocence of one who has taken life in both hands; of one who has gone down among the sins and temptations of life, and has come out of them pure and unsoiled.

(2) But the idea that was in John's mind when he called Jesus the Lamb of God was not so much innocence or any other quality, but the thought of death or sacrifice. 'He was led as a lamb to the slaughter,' says Isaiah, and the Passover lambs, if they were passing by at that moment, were being led to Jerusalem to be offered as a sacrifice to God. But they are unwilling victims, these lambs; they go to their death reluctantly. So their deaths have no moral significance. But the remarkable thing about the death of the Lamb of God is that it is purely voluntary. Death did not choose Him. He chose death. He met it at the trysting-place that had been fixed from the beginning of the world, and He went to it though legions of angels were waiting to bear Him away from it. That's what makes His death a thing absolutely unique in the history of the world.

2. But why does John call Him the Lamb *of God*? For the very fullest of reasons. Because God provided Him and God accepted Him. He was provided by God—'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.' That's the great difference, the eternal difference, between Christianity and every other religion. In other religions man provides the sacrifice for his God. In Christianity God provides the sacrifice for man. If it cost Christ something to die, it cost the Father something to give Him up to death. The two are in absolute unity in working out man's salvation.

And so the Lamb of God, which God Himself provides, is accepted by God. It is because He is provided by God and accepted by God that He is able to save us to the uttermost.

3. 'Behold the Lamb of God, *which taketh away the sin of the world*.' What a tremendous sweep it is—the sin of the whole world. But if it is a great sweep, it is not done in any wholesale way. It is done by each individual having his own sin taken away. That is why John says, 'Behold!' Every man must look for himself. When Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, it was only those who looked who were healed. I lay *my* sins on Jesus—not the sin of the whole world. I lay *my* sins on Jesus, the spotless Lamb of God. And even if we find it difficult to see why the death of Christ upon the Cross is an atonement for the sins of the whole world, does that prevent us from making the trial in our own particular case? If we want to travel by the electric cars, must we know all about electricity and the force that moves them before we do it? If we are thirsty, will we refuse a glass of water till we know what its chemical constituents are? 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' That is the gospel. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, because they are washed in the blood of the Lamb.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

Loneliness.

'For himself hath said, I will in no wise fail thee, neither will I in any wise forsake thee.'—He 13^5 (R.V.).

Loneliness is one of the most trying experiences possible to man. It never has been from man's creation, and never will be to all eternity, 'good for man to be alone.' Our Lord Himself, in the midst of His terrible conflict, felt keenly the burden of loneliness: 'Ye shall be scattered, every man

to his own, and shall leave me alone' (Jn 16^{32}). The only qualifying assurance which made that loneliness bearable to Him was—'Yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.' This feeling of isolation deepening into desolation reached an intensity of agony, fit to break His heart, in the moment when God and man seemed to stand aloof, and when from the depths of His anguish there went up the piercing cry that rent the heavens—'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' This was pre-eminently a *human* cry. Man yearns for fellowship—fellowship with man, and, above all, fellowship with God. To be without God is to be without hope. To be isolated from the great Father of spirits is to be orphaned indeed. The promise of our text—like that given by Christ on the eve of His own desolation, 'I will not leave you orphans'—is a gospel to the orphaned heart of man when it seeks God if haply it might find Him.

No passage exactly parallel to the text can be found within the covers of this Book, the nearest approach being the words which were uttered by the Lord to Joshua, 'I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee' (Jos 1^{5}), and repeated by David to Solomon, 'He will not fail thee, nor forsake thee' (1 Ch 28^{20}). There is an apparent superfluity of negatives in our text which we do not find in either of these parallel passages. They occur in Greek five times in this brief sentence. The literal translation would be, as nearly as we can give it in English—'No, I will never fail thee, no, I will never, never forsake thee.' This repetition is exceedingly significant, since these words are given as the promise of God, with whom there is no idle word, no word which does not carry its peculiar burden of sacred significance.

1. God's promise *projects itself into the unknown future*. 'I will *never* leave thee.' Man cannot live in the present. He ever looks forward. His hopes and fears come from life's morrows. This accounts for the interest which promises and predictions ever awaken in the heart of man. The gospel for man must have something to say about the time to come. Our Lord struck the keynote in the Sermon on the Mount by announcing the great 'Hereafter,' and drawing therefrom the most powerful considerations for present duty and privilege. Man repudiates being shut up to the present. He protests against mortality, and in his inmost heart will not admit of the possibility of dying quite out. From his earliest days he yearns for what he can keep. His grip of even temporal things is that of an immortal being. One of the most pathetic phases of human life is that he who wants things which he can keep is always snatching at things which he cannot keep. He has aspirations which earthly possessions, attainments, and friendships cannot satisfy. God meets that yearning in all who trust Him with the assurance, 'I will never leave thee.' In other words—'Through all time, and for all eternity, thou shalt draw from My resources, thou shalt satisfy thy life in the light and beneath the smile of thy God.'

2. The promise *includes every change of circumstance and variety of experience*. The words of God by the mouth of Isaiah emphasize this: 'When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee' (Is 43^{2}). In the face of the infinite variety of disappointment and trouble is the permanence of this Divine promise that God will be with us. The 'I am' is the name in which God speaks to man amid the whirling changes and startling transitions of our mortal life. None but the eternal and unchanging God, as revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord, can satisfy our yearnings and meet our needs. It is, however, enough if He be with us. The consciousness of His presence and blessing has been that which in all ages has sustained God's saints, and imparted to them the truest heroism. They undertook no task without Him, but, having once accepted the most difficult work for Him, they 'endured as seeing the invisible.'

This ray of promise falls on darkened ways,
'Lo, I am with you alway—all the days.'
The bright, untroubled, gladsome days of life,
The days of bitterness and care and strife;

The days when peace doth like a river flow,
The days of grief with weary hours and slow.
He goes not on far journeys. Christ is near,
He leaves no day without His help and cheer.

As once of old 'He knew what He would do,'
When servants were dismayed and troubled too,
So now, with infinite supplies at hand
He walks with us, though in a barren land.

Some sweet surprise He doubtless has in store,
Some secret that He never told before.
For this, perhaps, He leads through shaded ways,
And you will understand ere many days.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Number of the Hours.

'Are there not twelve hours in the day?'—Jn 11[9].

These words were spoken by Jesus at the time when news had been brought Him that Lazarus was sick. For two days Jesus had made no move. The disciples would be certain to misconstrue that inactivity—they would whisper, 'Our Master at last is growing prudent'—and therefore their amazement and dismay when Christ announced He was going to Judea. They broke out upon Him with expostulation—'Lord, it was but yesterday that you were stoned there. It is as much as your life is worth to think of going—it were the rankest folly to run that tremendous risk.' And it was then that Jesus turned upon the Twelve, with a look which they never would forget, and said to them, 'Are there not twelve hours in the day?'

Let us use these words to illumine some of the characteristics of the Lord.

1. They throw light on the *earnestness of Christ.* Behind all stir and change, and the varied and free activity of Christ, we discern the pressure of a mighty purpose moving without a swerve towards its goal. From the hour of His boyhood when He said to Mary, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' on to the hour of triumph on the Cross when He cried with a loud voice, 'It is finished,' unhasting and unresting, without one check or falter, the face of Jesus is set in one direction; and it is when we come to recognize that unity, hidden amid the luxuriance of freedom, that we wake to the sublime earnestness of Christ.

One reason of our Lord's whole-hearted zeal was His knowledge that there were only twelve hours in His day. Before His birth, in His pre-existent life, there had been no rising or setting of the sun. After His death, in the life beyond the grave, the day would be endless, for 'there is no night there.' But here on earth, with a mighty work to do, and to get finished before His side was pierced, Christ was aroused into triumphant energy by the thought of the determined time. 'I must work the works of my Father while it is day. The night cometh when no man can work.'

It is the same with us—twelve hours, no more. Time is fugitive indeed; the golden hours pass swiftly with their happy opportunities of serving God and man; let us not permit any of them to slip away in careless oblivion of their precious chances. God has sent us here to do something, to attain to something, to let ourselves flow out in helpfulness to others. Seize the moment, indeed, and extract all its marrow of satisfaction, but let that satisfaction be a worthy one—the satisfaction of knowing that we are fulfilling a heavenly mission, serving our Divine Father through our human brothers and sisters while the chance is still ours.

> Night comes behind.
> I needs must hurry with the wind,
> And trim me best for sailing.[1]

2. The text illuminates *Christ's fearlessness,* and that indeed is the textual meaning of it, for it was when the disciples were trying to alarm Him that Jesus silenced their suggestions so. What did He mean? He meant, 'I have my day. Its dawn and its sunset have been fixed by God. Nothing can shorten it, and nothing can prolong it.' It was that steadying sense of the Divine disposal which made the Christ so absolutely fearless, and braced Him for every 'clenched antagonism' that rose with menace upon the path of duty. When Dr. Livingstone was in the heart of Africa, he wrote a memorable sentence in his diary. He was ill, and far away from any friend, and he was deserted by his medicine-carrier. But he was willing to go anywhere provided it was forward, and what he traced with a trembling hand was this: 'I am immortal till my work is done.'

3. The text illuminates *Christ's fretlessness.* For never was there a life of such untiring labour that breathed such a spirit of unruffled calm. Now He was teaching—now He was healing—now He was parrying some cruel attack. Yet through it all, with all its stir and movement, there is a brooding calm upon the heart of Christ that is only comparable to a waveless sea asleep in the stillness of a summer evening. And no man will ever be calm as Christ was calm who cannot halt in the midst of the stir, and say, 'My peace'; who cannot stop for a moment in the busiest whirl, and say to himself, 'My times are in Thy hand.' God never blesses unnecessary labour. That is the labour of the thirteenth hour.

[1] Lanier.

Just here we ought to bear in mind that the true measurement of life is not duration. We live in deeds, not breaths—it is not time, it is intensity that is life's measurement. Twelve hours of joy, what a brief space they are! Twelve hours of pain, what an eternity! We take the equal hours which the clock gives, and we mould them in the matrix of our hearts. 'Are there not twelve hours in the day?' said Jesus—yet Jesus died when He was thirty-three. The dial of God has got no minute hands, its hours are measured by service and by sacrifice.[1]

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Meekness of the Cross.

'Not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others.'—Ph 2[4] (R.V.).

1. *The humility of Christ.*—The Atonement was the act of the Eternal, who, in the Person of the Son, emptied Himself of all that lifted Him above the race of men whom He came forth to redeem. He approaches mankind not as their benefactor, but as their debtor. The form of a slave is no human pageantry, but the sacramental expression of a Divine surrender. Tragedy enters into the very existence of the Living God. The Eternal Himself passes through the Valley of Humiliation. As the Bible shows us Redemption, it is not an Almighty Benefactor conferring a priceless boon upon His graceless children, but the Servant of servants, who lays aside His vesture and girds Himself as with an apron that He may wash His people's feet. 'He took upon him the form of a slave.' Those are the Apostle's words; and we denude them of their appropriate meaning if we fail to see that as St. Paul spoke them it is God Himself to whom they are properly applied, and not alone that Manhood which, in the terms of our orthodox theology, we say that God assumed. For He who from all eternity was in the form of God is God. God, and none but God, could humble Himself when, renouncing those riches which were His before the worlds, for our sakes He became poor, and from a life of servitude passed to a Cross of Shame. Humility was not first brought to the birth in the stable at Bethlehem, nor was the Cross the earliest throne where it received the Crown. Its reign was already from of old when the morning stars sang together. It was as the sword in the hand of St. Michael when Lucifer was thrust down from heaven. It is the spirit in which from creation's earliest dawn the Divine finger has wakened all things into life; the spirit in which a bounteous Providence, beholding the things that are in heaven and earth, has crowned the year with His goodness; the spirit in which the Father has wistfully sought the love and friendship of His children. Humility is not the creation of God's hand. It lives in the beating of His heart. As He loves, so He humbles Himself. And the Death of His Son was no benefaction with which, out of the riches of an infinite liberality, He endowed the poor, but the offering with which He pressed His suit upon a reluctant people, saying to each one of us, 'My son, give me thy heart.'

That is the consideration which gives to humility its true dignity and value in the character of the Christian man.

2. *Humility a Christian grace.*—It is important to remember that the service of man need not involve the spirit of sacrifice which is the joy of Calvary, may lack that great humility which is the mind of Christ. 'Blessed are ye poor.' 'Be not ye called benefactors.'

The appeal of Jesus is to something higher than the merely moral man. Those who are indeed to be constrained by the love of Christ must be prepared for adventures into a region which lies beyond the ethics of the market-place. The graces of the Christian character—meekness, forgiveness, humility—are not such as can be expressed in terms of scientific analysis.

Watch Christ in His dealings with the young man who asked what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life. He had come prepared to do great things. There was nothing about him that was sordid or base. No sooner had the Master's eye rested on him than Jesus loved him. It is clear that in his great possessions the young man saw large possibilities of service. It was no selfish refusal to abandon the means of personal pleasure or sensuous delights that at length sent him away sorrowful. There was a true nobility, not the mean desire to secure the next world in order that he might enjoy this, that expressed itself in the eager question, 'What good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?' The pathos of the story lies surely in the inability of an otherwise large heart to take the one step which should cut him off from the prospect of an honourable success and transform

[1] G. H. Morrison, *The Wings of the Morning*, 236.

the spirit of magnanimous service into the heart of humble sacrifice. If Christ had said, 'Spend your wealth, occupy your time, devote your life for the good of others; place those exceptional advantages of head and heart with which liberal Fortune has endowed you at the service of your fellow-men,' would he not eagerly have embraced the prospect of a useful and honourable career which the Master had opened before him? But there was something so paradoxical in the demand which Jesus really made; the romance of it was altogether so baffling to the imagination that in the very moment of a glad surrender to a great enthusiasm the young man shrank back from the impossible. 'Sell all that thou hast. Make your act of distribution to the poor once for all. Cut off once and for ever all further opportunities for benevolence and kindly patronage. Seek that treasure which is to be the instrument of your devotion not on earth, but in heaven, and come follow Me. Henceforth be poorer than the foxes and the birds. Call no place your home. Stand forth in the simplicity of your personal life, and, when the time comes, be ready for the cross of a criminal and the ignominious death of a slave.'

It is just that demand, and nothing less, that Christ is making of the men of this generation. The age is full of generous impulse. There are, as of course there always have been, the idle rich, the frivolous wastrels, who are not grieved for the afflictions of Joseph. But there is no lack of those who are not only willing but eager to make the best of their lives, to occupy positions of responsible usefulness, and to become real servants of their fellow-men.

But what if Christ should apply to any such the supreme test, 'Sell all that thou hast,' what then would be the answer? You would be perfect, —then renounce the opportunity. You seek a real adventure,—forgo your vantage-ground of wealth, station, official responsibility; take up your cross and follow Me.

3. *The source of humility.*—Many descriptions of humility fall infinitely short of its true proportions.

(1) It is doubtless true that 'God is in heaven, and thou upon earth,' and that therefore it becomes the children of men to refrain their souls and keep them low. But just as many a man will talk bravely of the rights of property who is yet careful to add that 'of course, we are only stewards,' so the infinite distance which separates the creature from the Creator may encourage rather than repress a spirit which is the reverse of humility in the narrower sphere where comparison is not impossible, but inevitable. Nor can that lay claim to rank as a Christian virtue which depends for its realization upon the chasm that separates human personality from Divine. If it be true that, as the Hebrew prophet bids us, we are to walk humbly with our God, or, as the Christian Apostle puts it, to humble ourselves beneath His mighty hand, we must seek the principle of this self-abasement elsewhere than in the infinite distance which separates our little lives from His august Eternity.

(2) It is the same thought which prevents us from fixing this principle in the recognition of human sin. For those who have sinned, the broken and the contrite heart will never fail to be one aspect of Christian humility. God must indeed break the backbone of that stubborn pride to which the Cross is a perpetual scandal and Calvary a superfluity of pain. But in proportion as Christian men attain the height of their destiny, in proportion as they are conformed to the image of the Eternal Son—nay, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory—then, though to themselves the shadow of a sin-stained past is ever present to move to self-abhorrence and unseal the fount of penitential tears, yet it is the reflexion of the heavenly vision which brings others to take knowledge of them that they have been with Him who is meek and lowly in heart.

(3) Humility, like every aspect of the character that is truly and properly Christian, must find its spring no less than its goal in the character of God. St. Peter had entered into the mind of the Master when he gave the exhortation to be 'clothed with humility.'

The man whose character exhibits this crowning grace is he who in his work for the good of others is not unwilling to believe that those on whose behalf he labours are ever his superiors; who so banishes self-consciousness that his personality—and not his goods—is at the disposal of his fellow-men; and for whom the object of loving solicitude is 'the brother for whom Christ died.' The man who instinctively rejects all talk of inferior races, and to whom it is against the grain to speak of the aborigines or the proletariat, is learning to be humble. These are traits that

reveal the man. They exhibit something of that Divine courtesy which could not bear help to mankind except in the character of a slave. Servitude to our fellow-men is an attitude that is painful to us all. But it is the brand of the Lord Jesus. That great Christian, St. Paul, gave as the motive of his abundant labours, his tireless activity, his ceaseless solicitude, the truly remarkable reason—I am a debtor. As with Sir Walter Scott, the desire to pay his creditors quickened his genius. He was expressing the mind that was in Christ Jesus. How full of romance will be the career of him who day by day can go forth to new opportunities, new conquests, new achievements, under this great compulsion—I am a debtor! No man will be dull if only you can approach him with the thought—I am a debtor. No dependence will be a wound to our self-esteem if only joyfully and thankfully we can exclaim, 'We are debtors.'

It is never the service that he renders, but the spirit in which he renders it, that distinguishes the Christian. Whatever the conditions of his outward life may be, poverty is always his bride. Even if his station be splendid, he wears it but as the pontificals of office, beneath which are the coarse garments of his daily life. His ideal is not to live for others, but to die for them. The humble man is he who is capable of that only form of self-sacrifice which admits of no degrees because it is whole, final, and complete, and that is the sacrifice of himself.

When St. Paul acknowledged himself all men's debtor, he went on to indicate the form in which he hoped to discharge the account—'So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel.' Like his Divine Master, he had learned through the things which he suffered that man doth not live by bread only, but by the living Word. And these have ever been the uses of the desert—'I humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not.' Pride scorns the notion of a Lenten fast. Why sojourn in a barren land? Shall God indeed prepare a table in the wilderness? But the humble, as His friends and guests, take their place at God's board; they eat of His bread and drink of the wine that He has mingled. So Christ gives to them the heart of sacrifice, and among the servants of men they are distinguished by one mark of difference, and by one only. As with the rest they go forth to their work and to their labour until the evening, the brow of each is circled with a crown of thorns.[1]

Palm Sunday.

The Tears of Christ.

'And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it.'—Lk 19[41].

In the morning Christ set forth on His journey from Bethany to Jerusalem by the road which went over the southern shoulder of Mount Olivet. 'As he drew near, at the descent of the mount of Olives'—when the road began to descend and the first view of Jerusalem was caught, the hymn of triumph broke forth, 'Hosanna to the Son of David.'

Again the procession advanced. The road descends a slight declivity, and the glimpse of the city is again withdrawn behind the intervening ridge of Olivet. A few moments, and the path mounts again; it climbs a rugged ascent, it reaches a ledge of smooth rock, and in an instant the whole city bursts into view. Immediately below was the Valley of the Kedron, here seen in its greatest depth as it joins the Valley of Hinnom, and thus giving full effect to the great peculiarity of Jerusalem seen only on its eastern side—its situation as of a city rising out of a deep abyss. It is hardly possible to doubt that this rise and turn of the road, this rocky ledge, was the exact point where the multitude paused again, and 'he, when he beheld the city, wept over it.'[2]

There are only two occasions on which it is recorded that Jesus wept. This is the second. The first was at the grave of Lazarus. And there is one thing common to both occasions which should be noted. It is that Christ's tears were not for Himself, but for others. They were not wrung out of Him by suffering; they were tears of tender compassion. And whenever one thinks of that, one is impressed again with the wonder of the figure of the Christ, so infinitely pitiful and tender-hearted; so unswervingly and magnificently brave.

'He beheld the city, and wept over it.'

1. They were *the tears of a Patriot.* Instinctively the multitude had paused with Him as they turned the crest of Olivet to gaze for a moment on the

[1] J. G. Simpson, *Christus Crucifixus*, 4.
[2] A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, 192.

splendid spectacle of Jerusalem glowing in the morning sunlight with its massive walls.

Jesus was interested in every land and in every race. No land or race was shut out from His heart. But there were special attachments to Palestine, and strong ties to the Holy City. He did not weep because Jerusalem was not everlasting, and because Palestine was not for ever. He knew that in the fullness of time the earth would be dissolved, and that previous to this consummation cities would rise and fall; but He could not bear to think that while other lands were fertile, this should be as barrenness, that while other cities stood, this should be a desolation, that while other nations were continued, this people should be scattered abroad. They were 'His own,' His own race, His own flesh and blood.

2. They were *the tears of a Saviour*. Jesus Christ came to save His people from their sins, and they would not. 'Ye will not come to me that ye might have life.' He looked upon those who would not be saved, and wept over them. Measure His sorrow by His knowledge and by His hatred of sin; measure His sorrow by His own freedom from sin; measure His sorrow by the love of His large heart. To see evil and to be unable to remedy it is anguish; but to see evil, to be able and willing to remove it, and to be baffled by the wilfulness and waywardness of the sufferer or of the evil-doer, is anguish keener and deeper still.[1]

Jerusalem had missed its opportunity. Again and again He had preached there, but Jerusalem had closed its ears and steeled its heart against the message of redeeming love. It had not known 'the day of its visitation.' There are in the lives of all of us times of visitation. At all times our opportunities are great. But there are times when God draws much nearer to the soul—as in sickness, as in affliction, as in bereavement—when God's truth shines out more clearly, when the powers of the world to come are realized, when eternity opens before the soul, when the conscience is tender and the world for a time loses its power.

Easter Sunday.

The Morning Glory.

'He is not here: for he is risen.'—Mt 28[6].

What a sunrise this was after these dark days of disaster and hopeless defeat! The great Lover had seemed to be the very fountain of life, with quickening vitality which nothing could destroy, and yet the fountain had been choked up in Gethsemane and Calvary! 'We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel,' but the shining, welcoming pool proved to be only a mirage, hope withered in disillusionment, and the brutal majesty of material force held the entire field.

And so all the disciples were in a mood of deepest and darkest depression. Simon Peter was gloomy with despondency and haggard with remorse. Two disciples were walking in the twilight to Emmaus, 'looking sad,' communing about the awful and sudden eclipse in which their hopes had been so miserably quenched. In every life the light was out. No one was anxiously watching on the third day, with eyes intently fixed upon a mysterious east. No; death reigned, and wickedness, and hopelessness, and no one was looking for the morning!

And then came the cry, 'He is risen!' Think of that great burning light streaming through the darkness, kindling life after life into blazing hope again—now the Magdalene, now Peter, now John, now the two journeying to Emmaus, now Thomas, until the entire disciple band was a circle of light again.

What did the Resurrection mean?

1. It meant first that Jesus of Nazareth had been clearly manifested to be the Son of God. Before this wonderful morning the disciples had been the victims of uncertainty, chilled by cloudy moods of doubt and fear. But with the resurrection the uncertainty ends. It is with that trumpet note that St. Paul begins his great letter to the Romans. 'Jesus Christ . . . declared with power to be the Son of God . . . by the resurrection from the dead.' Not, you will notice, 'declared to be the Son of God with power'; the power belongs to the declaration, the proclamation, the trumpet.

2. The second thing which the Resurrection meant was new power to men, a reservoir of spiritual energy opened for the quickening and emancipation of the race. It is our faith that just as Christ walked out of that tomb we too can walk out of the grave and graveyard of our own corrupt past, and in vigour and sweetness of being become alive unto God.

Surely we have a wonderful symbolism of all this in the mystic movements of the spring-time. If any one would be besieged by suggestions of the

[1] S. Martin, *Rain upon the Mown Grass*, 217.

resurrection, let him look about in garden and in field and he will see the quickening glory. 'Never do I,' says Dr. Jowett, 'so intensely feel the pressure of the quickening Spirit as when I see the black hedgerows bursting with their flooding life into green and tender leaf. Never do I so realize the surging, encompassing energy of God's resurrecting Presence. I can pray with more intimate and eager communion, when the dominion of winter is breaking, and the time of the singing of birds is come. "In Christ shall all be made alive!"'

We would have the resurrection power flow into our dead affections, and make them bud in tender sympathies, and gentle courtesies, and all the exquisite graces of the heart of our Lord. And we would have the resurrection power pervade our dead conscience, and make it act with hallowed sensitiveness, with fine scrupulous feeling of the sacred and the profane. And we would have the resurrection power possess our mind, and make it fertile in noble ideals, in holy purpose, and in chivalrous resolution.

3. (1) The resurrection meant not only something for the present, but something for the future. Christ brought not only life but immortality to light.

'Truly there is nothing any one can do in the face' of death, are the words on a second-century papyrus. A certain Taonnophris [1] and her husband Philo have apparently lost a son, and a friend Irene, who had herself suffered bereavement, writes to condole with them in the following terms:

> Irene to Taonnophris and Philo, good cheer! I was as much grieved and wept over the blessed one, as I wept for Didymas, and everything that was fitting I did, and all who were with me. Epaphroditus and Thermouthion and Philion and Apollonius and Plantas. But truly there is nothing any one can do in the face of such things. Do you therefore comfort one another. Farewell!

Very touching, is it not? The desire to mourn with those who mourn, and yet the feeling of utter helplessness in the presence of what death brings—'Truly there is nothing any one can do in the face of such things.' How unlike the calm tone of assurance with which St. Paul comforts the Thessalonian mourners in like circumstances: 'We would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as the rest'—Irene, Taonnophris, Philo, and all similarly situated—'which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him' (1 Th $4^{13.\ 14}$).

(2) Our Lord's resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of all that shares His nature. The Apostles early laid hold of the fact that in the resurrection right was manifested as the ultimate might. It had seemed to the apostles as though the truth had been defeated, and that amid the laughter and ribaldry of its foes it had sunk in complete and final disaster. But on the Easter morn the truth emerged again.

The great resurrection chapter, the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, ends with the thought of the indestructibility of the Christ-like—'wherefore, my beloved brethren,' St. Paul says, 'be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.' He seems to say, 'Your Lord emerged from the grave in irresistible strength and glory. There were no bonds strong enough to hold Him. So shall it be with the truth in our life and service. It shall not go under in endless defeat. Every bit of truth shall live, every bit of chivalrous service shall abide for ever.' 'Wherefore, be ye stedfast, unmoveable'; go on living the truth, speaking and doing the truth, even though immediate circumstances crush you like a juggernaut—go on—there is resurrection power in the truth, and it shall reappear and surely conquer, and your labour shall 'not be in vain in the Lord.' [2]

[1] G. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, 106.

[2] J. H. Jowett, *The School of Calvary*, 121.

Can a Divine Revelation be Ambiguous?

By the Reverend Edward Beal, Tsolo, South Africa.

To regard the Synoptic Gospels as inerrantly historical documents can no longer be termed a critical possibility. It is only natural, therefore, that many people should conclude that there exists no thoroughly authoritative foundation for the Christian faith. They imagine that, because the alleged revelation of God has been clearly shown to be subject to scientific investigation, and because it can be demonstrated that there are in the Gospels accretions which do not belong to the original figure of Jesus, the so-called revelation can no longer be truly deserving of its name. Granted that the Divine Being had determined to give a genuine revelation to mankind, would that message not have been placed high above the ambiguities of criticism? Can a Divine revelation be fallible?

If there can be found any true historical framework for Christianity, without doubt we must go to the Synoptic Gospels for it. For these documents profess to tell us the story of the life and teaching of the Person in whom the faith of the modern Christian is centred. And when we come to these Gospels, we find that the question of inspiration is considerably simplified and narrowed down. In this case we are not concerned so much about the divinely enlightened insight of the writers as about their historical accuracy. Indeed, it does sometimes appear to us that little inspiration was needed in their case: ordinary painstaking precision would surely serve the occasion. They merely required to interview living eye-witnesses of Jesus' life and ministry. And since their task was such a simple one, how are we to be expected to stake our whole fate, so to say, upon these records when we are assured that the story is not to be taken with absolute literalness? It would be impossible in a short article to attempt to deal with the problems which probably faced the Evangelists. If we are to attempt to answer these difficulties, it can be possible only by means of a reference to the involutions of our spiritual life to-day.

I.

What is the Christian faith? It is the conscious identification of the whole human personality with Jesus Christ. It is a complex far vaster than mere belief in certain undoubted historical facts. In its possession of historical data Christianity takes no precedence before other modern religions. The savage accepts certain historical events when he believes that the god of his clan has at a certain time appeared and devoured the tribal feast that has been dedicated to him. The Mormon accepts certain historical data. He believes, for example, that the heavenly book was deliberately handed to one of the leaders of his sect by God Himself. Nor can the superiority of our religion be established on the grounds of the superiority of its history over that of other creeds, for there are multitudes of folk who are prepared to credit the fact of Jesus, but have by no means vowed allegiance to Him. As Professor Robertson says, 'Belief may be said only to grasp at a fact that is still largely beyond the horizon of the soul.' It therefore follows that historical evidence can never furnish an exhaustive authority for any religion. In other words, though there might be such a thing as a historical revelation, we could never expect to find it conclusive, absolute.

II.

Because faith is an emotion involving the whole personality, it follows that whatever ultimate authority there could be would require to meet and to transcend that personality. The authority of faith must be greater—immeasurably greater—than faith itself: greater than the human will; meeting, satisfying, and overwhelming every phase of our consciousness. Now, can the Bible in its entirety be said to meet this need? It is conceivable that the Jesus of the Gospels might—granted always that the picture is historical—but then only if by some mighty miracle His Person could be brought into vital touch with our own. But the Bible is ink and print notwithstanding the fact that its wondrous message often surpasses the deepest realities of our spiritual life. No mere act of credulity is sufficient to bring its central figure into fellowship with our hearts. A whole triune Godhead, we believe, is demanded by the intricacies of the personality.

The human soul can respond only to a living spiritual authority. You may call this authority the Christ of Experience or the Indwelling Spirit of God, or look upon it as a blending of reason, conscience, and will; the one fact of which we are convinced is that this Force is the true channel of religious experience. As Dr. Griffith-Jones puts it in his helpful article in *Peake's Commentary*, 'we are thrust back upon the intuitions of the spirit' when we endeavour to find a real Divine authority. To these intuitions the ultimate appeal of every revelation must be made, be it the word of preacher, teacher, prophet, or vision. The Synoptic Gospels are no exception to the rule.

III.

That God has never once intimidated this inward authority is the one outstanding fact of the spiritual history of mankind. No God-sent message or messenger has ever violated it. The highest appeals of Jesus were invariably addressed to it as He sought to arrest men with His loving offers of rest and forgiveness. But a plenary-inspired disclosure would immediately do violence to this faculty. The human reason, faced for once with an absolute and infallible command, would be coerced into the acceptance of the terms. Is there any aspect of the life of Jesus that so warms and attracts our homage as the fact of His voluntary assumption of the task of redemption before Him? It is God's way never to cajole or to compel man's affection, and the Synoptic figure of Jesus is God's mighty appeal to our spiritual intuitions. The very existence of the Gospels we owe to their essential humanness and amenability to experience. The Atonement of which they tell us is God's mighty endeavour to bring men's erring will into voluntary subjection to His own—a will erring because independent and autonomous.

In simple truth the historical Jesus is an appeal to faith, and the very essence of that appeal lies in the problematic nature of the evidence. An unambiguous revelation would not be an appeal at all; faith would be abolished because there would be no risk in our self-identification with Christ. In the life of Christian discipleship, to win all is to hazard all. There could be no outward infallible criteria. We need look for nothing whatever outside our own spiritual powers that shall take the form of incontrovertible proof. Nothing worth proving can be proven. In the whole round of earth there is nothing to which we ought to surrender our spiritual choice and critical sanction. 'We walk by faith, and not by sight; we are of good courage.'

Contributions and Comments.

Readings of the Scottish Bibles.

I.

In the December issue of The Expository Times, Mr. J. H. Terras calls attention to differences in readings at Jn $10^{28.\ 29}$ and 14^{6} in the A.V. and in what he calls Scottish Bibles. He says that 'as a rule Bibles printed in Scotland' read 'any' . . . 'none' instead of 'any *man*' . . . 'no *man*' at the former passage; and insert the word 'and' before 'the truth' in the latter.

From an examination of the unique collection of Bibles in this Library, I find that this is hardly an accurate or complete statement of the facts. The first edition of the A.V. Bible printed in Scotland, 1633; the first A.V. N.T. printed in Scotland, 1633; the 'Scottish editions' of 1635, 1637, 1642, and 1649 all reproduce these texts as they are given in the 1611 edition, 'any *man*,' 'no *man*,' and 'way, the truth.' The first edition printed in Scotland in which I have noted the alteration to 'any' . . . 'none,' and the insertion of 'and,' is that published by the King's Printers, Edinburgh, in 1675. Thereafter all the editions printed in Scotland which I have examined, till that of 1793, follow these readings 'any' . . . 'none,' and insert 'and.' But it is not merely the 'Scottish Bibles' in which these readings are found during that period. Generally speaking, the books printed from 1638 at Oxford, Cambridge, and London contain the very words to which Mr. Terras calls attention!

And the reason for this is not far to seek. In 1638 the Cambridge Press printed a most important edition in which many changes were introduced. Scrivener's *Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph*

Bible, 1873, p. xvii, specifically refers to this 1638 edition having added 'and' at Jn 14[6]—which he says 'held its place beyond Blayney's revision of 1769, but has disappeared in Bibles from D'Oyly and Mant (1817) downwards.'

The 1793 Edinburgh Bible has 'any *man*' . . . 'no *man*,' but it retains the 'and' before 'truth.' So do the Cambridge 1773, 1798, the Oxford 1791, and the Edinburgh 1795, 1797, and 1799 Bibles. In 1811 I find an Edinburgh Bible and N.T. with 'any' . . . 'none,' 'and.' This appears to be followed in similar Bibles printed in Scotland till 1847, when I find 'any *man*,' 'no *man*,' 'and.'

The 'Standard' Cambridge 1762 edition, edited by Dr. Thomas Paris, has 'any,' . . . 'none,' 'and'; but the 'Standard' Oxford 1769 edition, edited by Dr. Benjamin Blayney, has 'any *man*,' 'no *man*,' 'the way, and the truth.'

So far as I have examined, recent editions printed in Scotland follow the original A.V. readings. It is evident, therefore, that the alterations in these verses, like various similar slight alterations, were not peculiar to Bibles printed in Scotland.

R. KILGOUR.

The Bible House, London.

II.

In reference to a contribution to the December number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, on the subject of certain readings of the Scottish Bibles (A.V.), I find the explanation of their variation from the standard editions, in a critical apparatus and collation of the English Bibles (A.V.) which I constructed for private use some years ago.

'*And* the Truth' was probably taken from the Cambridge correction of 1638, although I have the reading in a London edition of 1633. It remained in succeeding issues until the beginning of the last century, and is still to be seen in certain copies, but the 'and' is not retained in the *Cambr. Par. Bible.*

In regard to the other texts quoted from Jn 10[28-29] the case is different. The addition of 'man' (v.[28]) and substitution of 'no man' for 'none' (v.[29]) are merely inferred from the fact of their disappearance from the above corrected edition of 1638, which substituted 'any' and 'none' for the original readings of the folio of 1611. As the substitutions were not removed before the edition of Dr. Blayney, Oxon. 1769, they had a wide circulation. So that 'any man' and 'no man' are the true readings of King James' Bible; whilst we may add that the early substituted readings are from that of *Geneva*.

The occurrence of the words quoted from the Scottish edition is therefore an *anachronism*. I have before me the issue of Blair & Bruce, Edinburgh, 1803, in which I have made a note of some twenty-five of these uncorrected readings. Interesting examples are 'David, King *of Jerusalem*' (Ec 1[1]), and 'led *by* the Spirit' (Gal 5[18]). Several of them are to be found in some of the modern English editions, but the Oxford Standard of 1769 is now generally followed.

The detailing of some *temporary* readings of the A.V. is singularly omitted from the Appendices of the *Cambridge Paragraph Bible*, where the many editions of Hayes of Cambridge, remarkable in this respect, are very inadequately noticed.

SAMUEL J. BASTOW.

Hawerby Rectory, Grimsby.

The Sacrifice of Isaac.

THE interpretation of the Sacrifice of Isaac in the December issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is a return to a method of treating the Old Testament Scriptures which appears now to be repudiated by most. Speaking of the 'typological' exposition of the Old Testament, Dr. Garvie, in *The Old Testament in the Sunday School*, says: 'All this learned and pious trifling must now be swept aside. The historical interpretation is alone the valid interpretation. The Old Testament has an interest and a value of its own, not as a cunningly constructed puzzle, which can be solved only by help of the New Testament, but as a record of human belief, worship, life. For the student of the history of religions even the details of the ritual do not need to have any such artificial significance imposed upon them, but have a genuine interest as showing how the human soul sought to express and satisfy its needs in its approach to God. It is a relief and a gain to escape from this world of shams in this typology, to the world of facts in the candid yet sympathetic study of the slow growth of the religious consciousness of man, fostered by the condescending activity of the revealing God by His Spirit by divers portions and in divers manners.'

To give the story of the Sacrifice of Isaac its proper historic setting and to learn whatever

lessons we can discover to have been in the mind of the writer is a more rational method of interpretation than to regard it as a puzzle, the solution to which may be found in the life of the Christ of two thousand years later.

The similarity in a few externals in the story, when compared with our Lord's death, occurred to such early writers as Origen and Augustine; while Theodoret, in a fanciful interpretation, even went so far as to see in Isaac the type of the Godhead, and in the ram the type of the Manhood of Christ. But external similarities are no sure guide to internal meanings, and the typological exposition breaks down in fundamentals. For, read the story as we will, if we are to accept Abraham as the type of the Father, and Isaac as the type of the Son, we must surely confess, whatever may be our views on the Atonement, that God the Father, of Himself, neither willed, nor encompassed, nor attempted to encompass, the death of the Son. The early followers of our Lord are definite in what they say as to the cause of the death of their Master. In Ac 3^{15} St. Peter says to his hearers, 'Ye killed the Prince of life,' and St. Stephen (Ac 7^{52}) speaks of 'the Righteous One, of whom ye have now become betrayers and murderers.' Moreover, the plain fact of the Abraham story is, that not Isaac, but the ram, was offered, so that if there is a type at all, it must be found in the latter. Again, as Isaac did not die on this occasion, there could be no resurrection, except in the vague sense suggested by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (11^{19}). Commenting on this passage in the *Century Bible*, Dr. Peake says, '"In a parable" may contain an allusion to the deliverance of Isaac as a parable of Christ's resurrection.'

The part which the narrator of the incident allows God to play is, as Dr. Skinner says in the *International Critical Commentary*, 'an anthropomorphic representation.' If God is good, can He command what, on other occasions, He declares to be evil? 'We cannot readily suppose,' says Dr. McFadyen in *The Use of the Old Testament*, 'that the God and Father of Jesus Christ ever did make so inhuman a demand upon a father.' The impulse to offer Isaac was an inward monition to which the patriarch, with his knowledge of the Semitic custom of child sacrifice, would be subject, and not an external command from a loving God. That there could be such a prompting indicates the imperfect stage to which the moral consciousness had then developed, a stage which was not outgrown centuries after the time of Abraham. The Old Testament instances of child sacrifice are proof.

Dr. Skinner states that the line of exposition which sees Abraham learning that the sacrifice of human life is not in accordance with the character of the true God is not altogether satisfying. There is no definite repudiation of human sacrifice, or any prohibition of such sacrifice for Abraham's descendants. The same writer admits, however, 'the possibility that the story is a legend explaining the substitution of animal for human sacrifice in some type of ancient worship.'

Two modern interpretations are noteworthy. One, already quoted, is that of Dr. McFadyen, who shows that the story teaches (*a*) that our most precious things must be willingly sacrificed at the call of God; (*b*) the real surrender is the surrender of the will; and (*c*) man's extremity is God's opportunity. The other is from the pen of an educationist concerned with the effects of the story upon the minds of the children. The Rev. T. Grigg-Smith, in *The Child's Knowledge of God*, devotes a chapter to the Sacrifice of Isaac. He shows that 'the effect of the story upon thoughtful children is the mental impression of a contemplated murder,' and that it is responsible for conceptions of a God who orders something He does not mean to carry through, a God who can speedily change His mind. This writer says, too, that 'the teaching of Isaac as a type of our Lord's sacrifice upon the Cross has been both incongruous and harmful, and has encouraged a false doctrine regarding the Sacrifice of Calvary.' The whole chapter, with its first-hand evidence, and its critical and constructive treatment of the subject, is adequate refutation of any method of exposition which regards the old-world story as a parallel of the Incarnation and Atonement of the Eternal Son of God.

R. PARKES.

Manchester.

Divergences between the Peshitta and the Sinai Syriac Accounts of Jesus' Reception of the Children.

THE REV. J. MATHEW, in the number for April, 1922, suggests from readings in SS that 'the children

were not quite infants, but of an age perhaps up to ten or twelve.' This, however, does violence to the expression τὰ βρέφη in Lk 18[15]. The word βρέφος is used of an unborn child, as in Lk 1[41. 44], or of a new-born child, an infant, a babe, as in Lk 2[12. 16] (the infant Jesus), Ac 7[19] (the casting out of babes in Egypt), 1 P 2[2] (ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, new-born babes, longing for milk), and 2 Ti 3[15] (Timothy's acquaintance with the sacred writings from early childhood, ἀπὸ βρέφους). The last passage, indeed, does not imply actual infancy, but the Jewish children were often taught to read the law at the age of five years. The children brought to our Saviour were evidently very young.

E. E. BALDWIN.

Batesford, Victoria, Australia.

For Christ's Sake.

THERE are at least some forty-four verses in the A.V. of the N.T. where the words 'for the sake of' occur, but they are the translation of six prepositions, namely, διά once with the genitive, 31 times with the accusative, ὑπέρ 8 times, and ἕνεκα, περί, ἐν, and χάριν once. The mediatorial work of Christ is expressed by the use of διά with the accusative. It was the purpose of God 'in the eternal will' (He 10[10]) that by or through Christ salvation should be mediated and bestowed (and in order to state this διά is used with the accusative). The same preposition is used with the genitive in many verses to express the personal agency (*e.g.* Ro 5[10. 11]).

In the important passage Eph 4[32], ἐν before Χριστῷ is used, as by Paul constantly, to express the fullness of Divine blessing for man which is in Jesus Christ; while again in 1 Jn 2[12] διά with the accusative sets forth the means whereby forgiveness comes.

Ὑπέρ, which really means 'for the sake of,' is used to express the obligation resting on persons in view of certain work done for them by others.[1]

Thus it is worthy of notice that God is never represented in the N.T. as doing anything for Christ's sake, but as always acting out of His own perfect love (Jn 3[16], Ro 5[8], 1 Jn 4[9]). It was the old pagan view that something done by means of sacrifice would secure the favour of the gods, and thus bring them over to the side of man. This way of thinking about God is clearly removed by the teaching of Christ Himself, who came to reconcile men to God, not God to men. Hence to think of God as being in any way influenced by what Christ did in the perfect sacrifice of Himself, or as being under any obligation to Him to do otherwise than He would have done, would be to think of God in a way derogatory to His Divine perfection and essential love. Would we not, then, in all our prayers and approaches to our Heavenly Father be treating the Divine Love more worthily, and be in closer touch with N.T. teaching, if we were to throw ourselves on the pardoning love of God, and embrace Christ as the way through whom God acts, saying with throbbing, grateful heart, 'This we ask of Thee through Jesus Christ our Lord,' rather than 'for the sake of Christ'? Would we not avoid some error in so doing?

Most certainly all we should do in the manifold services of the true life must be done, if at all worthily, in the Name and for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, who loved us and gave Himself for us. And we know that 'God was in him, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing our trespasses unto us' (2 Co 5[19]).

BUCHANAN BLAKE.

Glasgow.

[1] In none of the eight verses where ὑπέρ occurs is there any reference to God doing anything under a sense of obligation to Christ for what He had done.

Entre Nous.

ALREADY a large number of very appreciative notices of *The Christian Doctrine of Peace* have appeared. We quote the one from *The Times Literary Supplement* of 11th January.

CHRISTIAN PEACE.

It was with great regret that British theologians, and many interested in the wider aspects of religion

and Christian ethics, heard recently of the too early death of Dr. James Hastings. To his initiative and energy we owe a series of religious dictionaries and encyclopædias which are invaluable to English-speaking readers. He induced the foremost scholars of the world to assist him in his endeavour to present the vast accumulations of modern knowledge in a conveniently accessible form. He did not allow religious bias to influence his choice of contributors: if a man had exact knowledge and a sound judgment he sought his aid. But Hastings himself remained firmly persuaded of the truth of the Christian revelation. He trusted that patient argument would in the end peaceably lead men to share his faith; and it is fitting that the book, the final proofs of which he corrected shortly before his death, should deal with 'The Christian Doctrine of Peace.'

His last work is eminently characteristic of Hastings' temper and method. It is divided into chapters, each of which deals with some well-defined aspect of his subject. At the beginning of each chapter there is a bibliography of recent works which the author has consulted. Copious extracts from these works are given, and these extracts are joined together by usually brief, but often acute, comment. Naturally the standpoint changes from time to time. Especially in their utterances during the war, Christian teachers showed themselves by no means of one mind in their attitude towards peace. Hastings practically never quotes in order to condemn. His sympathies, in fact, seem on different pages to draw him in different directions, so reluctant is he to emphasize differences. Yet he had, and expresses, a profound feeling that war is wrong.

> War is an attempt to settle disputes by an appeal to force instead of to justice; and *in the present stage of our social development* the appeal to force, whatever form it may take, is in itself so profoundly immoral, so gross an outrage on truth and right, that our attempts to refine and humanize it are as futile as would be the attempt of a legislator to secure humanity in the commission of murder or decency in the commission of rape.

It is but seldom that Hastings writes with such passion, and we have quoted the sentence because in it he lifts for a moment the curtain which hides his deepest feelings. He was not a 'pacifist' and did not believe that the doctrine of universal non-resistance was taught by Christ. To the question, 'Shall we live as though the Christian ideal were already supreme in a world that has hardly yet begun to understand it?' he gives the answer 'No.' But he qualifies that answer by insisting that 'we must keep the Christian ideal before us as the master light of all our seeing.' In the unsuspected capacities for sacrifice that were revealed during the war he sees the spirit of Christ active in human evolution. 'All true progress is by the way of the Cross.' If, in fighting, a man gives himself for a just cause, he follows the example of the Son of Man, Who gave His life a ransom for many. Yet the cause must be just when viewed in the light of our common humanity: 'There can be no insular or national or imperial limitations' in the Christian ideal.

Naturally Hastings warmly supported such collective efforts for peace as that represented by the League of Nations. But he saw that ultimately all depends upon the will-to-peace of the individual. Aggregates of men will never seek peace, save in times of exhaustion, so long as envy, hate and suspicion dominate private life. 'There must be good will, with all which that implies, love in place of hate, patience instead of hasty resentment, confidence instead of suspicion, justice in place of exploitation.' The Christian Church exists to make this far-reaching change of temper in its members. But, as Hastings said sorrowfully, 'the tragedy is that the Church has failed to express, in the world of actual fact and experience, the essential unity of those who are in Christ.' This statement accurately describes the failure of the Church, a failure not of clergy only, but of clergy and laity alike.

We are often tempted to think that a great editor or dictionary-maker must be dry, industrious, methodical, and therefore hardly a man of flesh and blood. If we recall the memory of Samuel Johnson, we class him apart, for his boisterous partisanship invaded even the famous dictionary. But Hastings, by his posthumously published work, proves that an immense capacity for detailed labour may be fully used without imperilling noble enthusiasms and humane sympathies. Beneath the heavy routine which shortened his life Hastings' spirit remained responsive to the finest idealism of his age. And surely we may say with truth that, had he been a self-absorbed pedant, his life-work

would have lacked the distinction for which it has been justly praised.

SOME TEXTS.

Zec. xiii. 3.

'What the prophet is inveighing against can never have been the warm inevitable utterance of good men, which indeed is the only light we mortals have in this dark world. What he is inveighing against is the uncostly, idle, casual indulgence of ourselves in words, spoken in serious times and often concerning serious things, words which even when we are uttering them we do not mean seriously, in the sense that we do not mean them to have any influence with ourselves. What the prophet is denouncing is the uttering of opinions which we have not weighed, which we simply emit with the view it may be of confirming ourselves in some prejudice or with the view merely of passing time.

'Against the idle use of words our Lord also gravely warns us, telling us that in the end of the day we shall be judged by the words we have spoken. But it was our Lord also who put this entire matter squarely before us, when He told us that in the end of the days those who are commended will be commended not for the words they have spoken but for the deeds they have done: that to them the Great Judge will say not "well imagined," "well thought-out," "well-proposed," "well-intended," "well-expressed," but "well done."

'For the unfinished is nothing: and a word that is unsupported and unconfirmed in a corresponding deed—is an unfinished thing.' [1]

Gal. iii. 16.

'This is how they do things between Cancer and Capricorn. Marriage is the great "game" here, and an "eligible" swoops up to the door of his "future's" hut, brandishes bow and arrows, yelling out the hundreds-of-years-old formula, "My game of the chase, where is it?" Then peering in, he aims at a bull's-eye mark in a clay image, a miss or hit being greeted with *ho! ho!* or *eya!* derision or congratulation, as the case may be. Next day comes the shaving, bathing and anointing; then the muster in front of the hut, the girl sitting with bows and arrows across her knees, a nasty notification that death is the doom of infidelity. Then comes the long antiphonal Marriage Song.

'But polygamy spoils it all. Paul has been badly handled by the Critics on the score of bad grammar. Has been made a quibbler in that old polygamic phrase sounding across Africa, "Not unto seeds, as of many, but unto thy seed." Really here it is you almost defy a monogamic professor in Oxford to see the good sense in this "bad" syntax. One of them, commenting upon this "*Unto seeds, as of many, but as of one*" in Galatians, characterises this as "hair-splitting" on the Apostle's part; "it shows traces of his Rabbinical training," he says, and questions whether the verse has "ever been intelligible to any man." Now here it is polygamic Africa can teach monogamic England: here Sarah, the "Maori," and Hagar, the concubine (*mwilombe*) is the daily story. The very plexure of the ramification of polygamic kinship compels them to tie down the rights of succession to *one* son; so that this very sentence, "not unto seeds, as of many, but as of one," is a trite bit of African chatter all the year round stereotyped in the language. Out of ten or twenty brave, well-oiled polygamic boys the choice either at birth or in youth is made of *one*, and the remaining nine or nineteen are utterly ignored, for *not* "unto seeds as of many" is their Prince of Wales-ship due, but as of *one*. Of course, the status of the mother generally determines the choice. Yes, both in Galatians and here there is a riot of grammar to obviate the other riot of princelings: they are all "the seed" royal, yet administrative unity demands that one "seed" *par excellence* sweeps away the plurality of "seeds," that have "no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth."' [2]

Luke xv. 20.

'It will readily be recalled that our destination ahead on Lake Mweru is a Mission Station. In its specialised form this "Mission Station" is a portmanteau-word with all sorts of implications. Better: it is a small (so they call it) City of Refuge (*Chinyemeno*), because the Government having only a 5 per cent. patrol of their vast territory, this means that at any moment some old woman or man can be done to death. Done to certain and

[1] J. A. Hutton, *Our Ambiguous Life*, 77.

[2] Dan Crawford, *Back to the Long Grass*, 154.

cruel death unless they rush over the hills and up the palm avenue to our ever-open door. To fail of arrival a few, even a very few, miles out would doom her. Take this grim old instance of the manslayer. Blood is blood, and this time it is blood of man not beast. A lad lies at my feet on the path stabbed mortally in two places with spear and axe wounds. Ten minutes farther back we crossed the tracks of the elephants that brought it all about. The wounded man's brother had joined his fellow in giving chase to the herd, had overtaken and in easy error shot his friend dead instead of the haystack, the elephant. The Mission as City of Refuge was too far off and the avenger's weapons had already drunk blood: "Oh, Bwana!" wailed the moribund, "I am dying because I did not meet you sooner; even although the Mission as Refuge was too far, yet *a man shall be for a refuge*, and *you* were my man, *you* would have saved me had you come in time." Had you come in time! A perfect picture this of the change from the dispensation of Law to that of Grace: as pungent as perfect, for did not the former demand that the *man* run to the refuge, whereas in Grace the *Refuge* runs to the man?

'I was weary at the moment, but what put new life into me was the picture of God and the Prodigal in Lk 15: you can verify it at your leisure, but it is probably the only time God is shown to be in a hurry, "the father ran to meet him!" Thus (to point the platitude) this dying man's inability to run in to us for refuge only half symbolizes the wholly dead souls unable to come to a Mission that is able to go to them. All this I poured into his dying ear as Gilead's balm: that Christ had come to him here and now by the wayside, that some died of bullets and some of old age, but that the body was but a phase and we were all bound for the Eternity where many of the great would be small and the small great. So died in the forest my life-for-a-life friend, died because I reached him too late, died with the name of Christ his Saviour on his lips.'[1]

A TOPIC.

Prohibition.

Norman Maclean has gathered together a number of articles which he had contributed to *The Glasgow Herald* and *The Scotsman*, and has published them with the title *Victory out of Ruin* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). They are written with Dr. Maclean's usual uncompromising directness, and are most timely. The book is the third of a series. The first volume, 'The Great Discovery,' portrayed the spiritual emotions of the War; 'Stand up, Ye Dead' dealt with the soul of the nation in the midst of its travail; the articles in this third book are linked together because they seek 'to point out the way of deliverance and renewal.' The fifth chapter, unlike the others, does not appear in its original form, but has been largely rewritten. It is an account of prohibition in the United States of America, called by Dr. Maclean 'The Last Deliverance.' We quote from it:

'There is nothing more to be desired than that the people of Great Britain should acquaint themselves with the facts regarding the greatest social advance ever made by humanity in a generation. Can it be the case that the millions of America committed an act of social folly when they outlawed the liquor traffic and closed the saloons, and that, awakening from their dream, they are to restore the traffic in alcohol and the saloon once more? That is the impression that a spoon-fed Press seeks to create.'

In this matter of the drink traffic the Press, with some exceptions, 'serves the public with doctored news.' 'One day,' Dr. Maclean says, 'we are told how a hundred thousand New Yorkers are to march in procession through the streets demanding the return of their alcoholic drinks. The columns are full of the preparations for the greatest uprising of the oppressed and parched citizens. The great day comes and the procession is a fiasco. But the syndicated Press omits to record that only a miserable handful paraded the streets, the offscourings of the city's purlieus, amid the derision of the onlookers. We are later informed under great headlines that the American Medical Association, or some such society, has called for the annulling of the Prohibition Law. We feel that the climate is bound to become wet again, for the doctors demand it. But we soon learn that this particular association of doctors is a mere fragment of a noble profession—a fragment separate from the American Association which corresponds to the British Medical Association. But the syndicated Press does not record that fact.'

Is it likely that the United States of America will restore the traffic in alcohol? If prohibition

[1] Dan Crawford, *Back to the Long Grass*, 64.

had been the result of a snap vote, the effect of a passing enthusiasm, it might be so. But Dr. Maclean points out that the movement had the toil and sacrifice and devotion of three generations behind it. 'There were long years of work in school and of teaching in the churches ere on the 18th December 1917 the Amendment in favour of Prohibition passed the Legislative Assemblies at Washington. Having passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, it had to be ratified by a majority of the various States. The States had seven years in which to ratify; but within one year and two months forty-five States, with a population of over one hundred millions, ratified the Amendment. Only three out of the forty-eight States failed to ratify. On the 29th January, it being certified that three-fourths of the States had ratified as the Constitution requires, the 18th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting alcohol, became law. And on that night the leaders of the movement held a service of thanksgiving in Washington, and when the hour struck ushering in the first day of the new era, Mr. W. J. Bryan began his address by reading the words: "They are dead that sought the young child's life." An Amendment to a National Constitution which has the generations behind it is not one to be repealed. To repeal it requires now a majority of three-fourths of the States! The one great fact to remember, is that by local option two thousand two hundred and thirty-five counties in the United States had made an end of the liquor traffic in their areas before Prohibition became the national law, and that there were only three hundred and five counties in all the States which had not declared themselves dry before Prohibition became the law. If anything be certain under the sun, it is that Prohibition is the settled and unalterable policy of the United States of America. During a visit of three months, and after inquiries in several cities, I never met a single person who wanted the saloon again reopened in the States. Whatever criticism might be made, there was among everybody only one sentiment regarding the saloon—and that was thankfulness that it was closed for ever.'

There are, however, Dr. Maclean admits, those in the United States of America who would like to see the Volstead law amended so that beer and light wines might be procurable. But he thinks this not likely to happen. 'The settled policy of the reformers,' he believes, 'is to seal up the sources of drunkenness. Every drunkard began as a moderate drinker; and the evil has to be stayed at its source. Mr. Bryan described the process dramatically: "The moderate drinker says every man should stop when he has had enough. But the difficulty is to know when one has had enough, for enough is a horizon that recedes as one approaches it. A frail brother was advised by a friend to drink a glass of sarsaparilla when he had had enough. 'That's right,' was the reply, 'but when I have had enough I cannot say sarsaparilla!'" The prevailing opinion among the Church and social leaders is that the liquor trade as it was conducted in America could not be mended, and that it had to be ended. And it was ended.'

NEW POETRY.

Harry Kemp.

The name of Mr. Harry Kemp must be already widely known in the United States. Is it known on this side? If it is not, we can safely say that it will be by the publication of two of his volumes of poetry—*Chanteys and Ballads* and *The Passing God* (Brentano's; $1.50 net and $1.25 net).

Mr. Kemp in his time has played many parts. He has been sailor, tramp, and train-jumper. He has seen the inside of jails, and has studied at the University. But 'rolling freights, jails, vermin, ships at sea, rough fo'c'sle companionships' were all parts of the material from which his music was to be fashioned. Contrary to what one might expect, his verse is smooth, polished, and melodious. Naturally, perhaps, he is always interesting. There is not a dull page in the two volumes.

O, when I die, say I lived ill,
Say that my days were poured
Like wasted wine, say all you will,
But never, 'Kemp was bored.'

Certainly Kemp never bores.

There is the tang of the salt-sea spray in *Chanteys and Ballads*, the wander-lust of one who 'always loathed the four walls of a room.' There are also certain powerful interpretations of the tramp's vision of Christ, the result of Mr. Kemp's study of

the Bible when in jail. The poem we take from this book is :

THE GOING OF HIS FEET.

His feet went here and there
About the common earth.
He touched to grandeur all
Men held of little worth.
. . . . .
He did not search a-far
For what He had to say :
His mind reached forth and drew
Its strength from every day :

The struggling nets, alive
With fish drawn from the sea
Supplied Him with the apt
And chosen simile . . .

He saw a neighbour build
A house that did not stand—
And men may not forget
The House Upon The Sand ;

He saw a widow drop
Her mite into the hoard—
And to eternity
That treasure is up-stored ;

He heard a publican
Who thought none other there—
The souls of all mankind
Are richer for that prayer. . . .

O, Poet of The World,
I pray Thee, come to me,
That my lame heart might walk,
That my dark soul may see ;

And teach me, too, to go
About the ways of earth
And find the Wealth of God
In things of little worth !

The Passing God consists of a long narrative poem, 'Cresseid,' which, in the opinion of Mr. Richard le Gallienne, who adds an appreciation to this volume, 'by itself is enough . . . to win for Mr. Kemp a high place among modern poets,' and a number of lyrics in which Mr. Kemp has wedded something of the light and delicate touch of the Elizabethan song-writers to the easy, polished exactness of the Restoration poets.

Malcolm Taylor.

There is a spontaneity about Mr. Taylor's verse that is very pleasant to the ear. A small volume of his, with the title *Poems, Part I.*, has just been published by Mr. Blackwell (1s. 6d. net). Most of the poems are variations on themes of nature, but in 'The Quest' Mr. Taylor turns to the human problem. It is the tale of the dauntless spirit setting forth on its lonely voyage.

The loneliness, the emptiness,
Of heart and soul and hand !
It crushes me like an iron press,
It maddened and unmanned.

In vivid lines Mr. Taylor paints the pageantry of strange and terrifying seas and fiery sunsets, lines that recall descriptions in 'The Ancient Mariner.' Indeed, the turn of the line and the use of repetition to heighten effect often remind us of it.

At eve, before had disappeared
The last red look of day,
The sea back on its haunches reared
Like a hunted beast at bay.
The sea back on its haunches cast
As by some ominous force
For a sign to me of what would be
If I changed not my course.

But there were times of comfort and strengthening in the journey.

Yet have there hovered round me oft
Strange shapes of insubstantial air
That smiled and beckoned from aloft
And waved me to the golden strand
Where they were dancing, hand in hand,
With garlands in their hair,
A visioned band, so blithe, so bland,
So sweetly debonair,
That naught could be more fair, more free,
Than those sweet spirits were.

The quest is not in vain, for after the age of

stormy seas the voyager meets Him whom he has unknowingly been seeking.

And then it was I saw Him first :—
A radiance from within Him shone.
I knew I had put forth alone
And wondered who it was that durst
Be with me now.
He came and stood Him at my side—
Marvelling I asked Him ; He replied,
'To thee am I a stranger, yet
To me no stranger thou.
Thy end of search here hast thou met—
I am Thyself, and free.'

'O Self, but Thou art fairer far
Than I e'er thought could be ! '
'Yea fairer, like a hidden star,
For all thy quest,' said He,
And at His each word a prison bar
Broke 'twixt heaven and me.

F. M. Hallward.

A poet is not always a safe guide to the merits of a brother craftsman's work, but Mr. Gordon Bottomley, who writes the Preface to a book of *Poems* by F. M. Hallward (Oxford : Blackwell ; 5s. net), has done justice to some really striking verse. Not that it is all of the same quality. Many of the poems have no merit beyond that of adequate rhythm and euphony, but at least a dozen can claim a good deal more than this. Mr. Bottomley names some of them. They are found among the sonnets and in the poems coloured by the War.

We quote instead of these a few verses of

Lost Causes.

Wherever men have agonized and bled
To dignify the lives their fellows led,
And failed, and the old order reigned instead ;

Wherever men with breaking hearts, have tried
To raise again the flag for which they died,
And failed to raise it and been cast aside ;

Wherever men have given their all to be
The messengers of love and liberty,
And failing of it perished miserably ;

There, 'mid the riot of the passing years,
Their noisy merriment and noisier tears,
That little, frustrate voice is all He hears ;

Who, turning from the mighty and the wise,
Bent on a broken reed all-seeing eyes,
And from lost causes builded paradise.

In the House of My Pilgrimage (Longmans ; 4s. net) is the title of a little book of devotional verse for which preachers will be specially grateful. We say 'preachers,' because these poems are admirably adapted to pulpit quotation. Take this, for example, out of the five Nativity hymns with which the book opens.

A Christmas Carol.

Moon, make a halo for His Head,
Stars, shine to guide us to His Feet,
Sun, let thy brightest beams be shed
Where lies the Baby small and sweet.
Sun, moon and stars before Him fall
This Baby cradled in a stall.
He made you all ! He made you all !

Flow'rs sweet in scent and fair in hue
Be plenteous where the Baby lies.
Songs, and sweet strains of music, too,
Smiles, and glad beams from human eyes.
Children, come dance with light footfall
To glad His watching Eyes withal.
He loves you all ! He loves you all !

Stained souls, slack wills, hearts bound to earth,
Sated, and still not satisfied,
Lips that laugh loud, yet know not mirth,
Go, seek to Bethlehem a guide.
From the sad entail of the Fall,
From sin's stern sway, from self's strong thrall
He saves us all ! He saves us all !

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The forty-first number of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* is devoted to a symposium on Eschatology in which such well-known scholars as L. Ginzberg, N. Schmidt, B. W. Bacon, F. C. Porter, and E. F. Scott take part. The essay by Professor Scott in particular is a notable contribution. It is on 'The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Mind of Jesus,' and shows how far the pendulum has swung back in twenty years.

For it is about twenty years since the Apocalyptic theory of the Gospels became prominent, and we have now come to what may be called the period of 'settling down.' There have been the usual violent swings to right and left, and, though it cannot be said that agreement has yet been reached, Professor Scott's fresh and searching examination of the subject will certainly help to that end.

He admits that Jesus was in sympathy with the Apocalyptic hopes of His time and used their expressions in their own sense. It is true that the first Christians probably exaggerated this element in His teaching. They were very ordinary men, and would interpret in a crude and literal sense much that He may have spoken figuratively. Still, there must have been something in the teaching itself that warranted their interpretation. But even if we admit this Apocalyptic element, it by no means follows that Jesus had any consistent 'Apocalyptic scheme' in His mind. His main concern was practical and religious, and, whatever forms He used to express it, this was dominant in His purpose.

As a matter of fact, however, the Apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus is both small and subsidiary. It is small. The affinities of Jesus were much more with the prophets than with the Apocalyptists. And it is subsidiary, for its function everywhere is to enforce a message that was *not* Apocalyptic. The real message of Jesus is independent of Apocalyptic ideas and can easily be detached from them. His demand was for a new kind of life, a new relation to God, and, while He looked for the Kingdom, His interest was in those moral requirements which it involved.

Indeed it may be fairly argued that, although Jesus fell in with the Apocalyptic outlook, His thought was in inward contradiction to it. The two outstanding features of Apocalyptic thought are that the Kingdom lies in the future, and that it will come suddenly by the immediate act of God. For this strain of thought was the outcome of a profound pessimism. In the world now running to decay there were no regenerating forces which by their own action would gradually bring about the

better time. God must Himself interpose, by an immediate act of power.

Now these ideas were completely opposed to the convictions by which Jesus lived, and which underlie all His teaching. He believed that God rules the world, and that everything is ordered by Him, so that not a sparrow falls to the ground without His knowledge. What He demands is the faith that God is reigning now, in spite of all the mystery in which His ways are enshrouded. This is the heart of the religion of Jesus. In like manner He is in conflict with the view that no forces are working for good in the present, and that if the Kingdom comes it must break in by a miraculous act. He sees the goodness of God in the rain and the sunshine and in human impulses that constantly lead to good. He makes His appeal, over and over again, to the goodness that is in men. In short, the whole aim of Jesus is to restore that faith which Apocalyptic had implicitly denied.

So what we find is a contradiction between the forms employed by Jesus and the inner drift and purpose of His message. Probably Jesus was not Himself aware of this contradiction. He took over the Apocalyptic ideas of His time without reflecting on their origin or the philosophy that lay behind them. Their use to Him was that they served to make real to Him His vision of a better world, in which the Will of God should absolutely prevail. They offered Him a definite goal towards which He could work. But all the time they were borrowed from a type of thought that was alien to Him.

That was its use to Him. Its use to *us* is that it gives us the key to His mode of expressing Himself, to the forms under which He thought and by which He was restricted. Jewish Apocalyptic has not provided us with the key to the teaching of Jesus. The task still remains of exploring the message itself.

One thing more. As a matter of history, Jesus destroyed the Apocalyptic view of the world, just as He destroyed the Law, although in both cases He claimed to be fulfilling. He throws all His weight on moral and spiritual ideas, and these in time burst the Apocalyptic sheath. Before the first century was over the message of Jesus had shattered the Apocalyptic scheme. By means of Apocalyptic He had proclaimed a faith which in the end shook itself free of the forms in which it had been stated.

What is really wrong with our traditional theology and venerable Creeds? We hear on all hands that the Church must unload and quietly drop them. We are told that, since the War in particular, theology is in the melting-pot. We have a dim notion that the melting-pot is rather overworked, and is largely unnecessary. What is needed is somebody who will render Christian doctrine a service similar to that which Moffatt and others have recently rendered to the New Testament.

We are not prepared, at any rate, to scrap the traditional theology on which generations of believers have been nurtured until we have seen how theology looks expressed in modern language. A language perplexity, we believe, is to a large extent the real difficulty for theology to-day. It is not that it revolts either the moral or the common sense of the plain man. The chief trouble is that the plain man does not understand it. To a very real degree it is commonly expressed in what is to him a foreign tongue, may we not say a dead language?

He who can explain doctrines in the familiar speech of modern everyday life is worthy of high honour and merits our warmest gratitude. Dr. Neville S. Talbot, the Bishop of Pretoria, can do it. He has done it in one of the most stimulating books we have read for some time, *The Returning Tide of Faith* (Nisbet; 5s. net).

It is a remarkably cheap book. It is not a large

work. It is not an exhaustive theological treatise. But if in no case it exhausts the topic handled, it never approaches exhausting the reader. It is a tonic, a genuine re-creation of the mind, to peruse it. It shows what is the real meaning of, and what the necessity for, each of the great Christian doctrines, and all in such limpid simplicity of language that the plainest of plain men may grasp and with keen interest follow the argument.

Simple as it is in style, it is never superficial. The Bishop knows and grapples with the kind of question that troubles the mind or the heart of the ordinary individual who reflects on his experience in this unintelligible world. What about the truth of the Bible? What about the heart-breaking seeming silence of God? What about Christ? What about the Virgin Birth? What about Hell? And so on. On every subject we have here a frank statement of difficulties, and real guidance towards their solution.

Specially good is the chapter on the Trinity. The Bishop sympathizes with those who feel resentment at the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. But he proceeds to show that the doctrine of the Trinity 'is the interpretation of that which was not made by man but was wrought out by God.' 'No speculation of man produced this almost incredible truth. It had not entered into the mind of man so to think of God. The truth took hold of men's minds through what God did in Christ. The assertion of threefoldness in the nature of God was not a quasi-mathematical fancy. It sprang from the succession of distinct moments or comings in the Divine action. There was the sending of the Son by the Father. There was the sending of the Holy Spirit. All was the action of God. It was not God, then a man (Jesus), and then an influence (the Spirit). But it was God acting in His Son, and God acting in the Spirit.'

'Historical event, then, lies at the heart of the truth of the Trinity. No man wove it, in spider-like fashion, out of his inner consciousness.'

'The upshot is a doctrine which makes the nature of God, as personal, far more intelligent than any doctrine which conceives of Him as merely one or single or solitary. For personality, as we know it on the human plane, is never merely individual, still less solitary. It never exists, it is never expressed, except in relationship with others. Further, it is revealed in action. It is most revealed in outgoing sacrificial action. . . . So God was revealed in all-fulfilling action in the giving of Himself in love which suffers all things for the sake of the beloved. He did not send someone else, He came, He gave Himself. That very essence of the Good News is utterly irreconcilable with any merely Unitarian conception of God.'

Professor Rufus Jones, the author of 'The World Within,' has written an excellent little work on personal religion. He calls it *Spiritual Energies in Daily Life* (New York: Macmillan; 6s. net). Dr. Jones is Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College, and one of the most interesting chapters in this book is a congenial one on 'Psychology and the Spiritual Life.' But the most suggestive part of the book is the Introduction, in which the writer deals with the nature of religion and describes it as *energy*. This, of course, is only one aspect of it, but he points out that it is an aspect of which the great experts have made much.

'Power' is a word that is often on the lips of Jesus, and always in reference to an intrinsic and interior moral and spiritual energy of life. The Kingdom of God comes with power, not because of any extrinsic authority or aid, but because it is a life-transforming energy, like the expanding yeast in flour or the forces of life in the soil.

So in the newborn Church the fellowship was 'endued with power' at Pentecost. Something new and dynamic entered the feeble band and left them no longer feeble. The Divine inward Presence revealed itself as a new energy. The important thing in their experience was not the ecstatic

utterance, but the heightened moral quality, the irresistible boldness, the fortification of their spirit. It is this energy which marks the event as an epoch.

St. Paul, again, writes as if he were an expert in dynamics. 'Dynamos' is one of his favourite words. He seems to have found out how to draw upon energies in the universe which nobody else suspected were there. He calls the incoming power by many names: 'The Spirit,' 'holy Spirit,' 'Christ,' 'the Spirit of Christ,' 'Christ in you,' 'God that worketh in us.' Whatever his word may be, his assertion is that God, as Christ revealed Him, is an active energy working with us and in us for a complete new creation in us.

Further, St. Paul does not confine his idea of this new power to the mighty spiritual forces that come down from above. Much more often our attention is directed to energies that are potential within ourselves—even the most ordinary of us. The Grace of God sums up the great descending energies, but this is met and enabled to operate by the inner energy, by which man responds to God's upward pull, and which Paul calls *faith*.

Faith, in Paul's sense, is not *believing* something. It is a moral attitude of will to the character of God as revealed in Christ. We know this sense of faith in many other fields; in finance, *e.g.*, and in society. In personal life also, *morale* is only another name for faith. Elicit faith and you can do anything. McDougall cites the case of a boy who was chased by a wild animal and leapt a fence which he could never afterwards negotiate, often as he tried. Psychologists quote many examples of this kind.

In the sphere of religion faith is just as powerful. It made a saint out of Magdalene, a spiritual hero out of Augustine, a creative leader out of the unstable monk, Luther. These possibilities are in us, but we are most of us the victims of limiting inhibitions. We hold intellectual theories which check the outflow of the energy of faith. We have a wise system of thought which accounts for everything and which leaves no place for faith. And yet there has seldom been a time when spiritual energies were more needed than to-day. Our troubles consist largely in failure to lay hold of those forces that lie near at hand. The ancient realities still abide, and the invisible forces of the spirit are as real as ever. That is the thesis of Dr. Jones' book, and he illustrates it by an incident.

'When the Hellgate bridge was being built over the East River in New York the engineers came upon an old derelict ship, lying embedded in the river mud, just where one of the central piers of the bridge was to go down through to its bedrock foundation. No tugboat could be found that was able to start the derelict from its ancient bed in the ooze. . . . Finally, with a sudden inspiration one of the workers hit upon this scheme. He took a large flat-boat, which had been used to bring stone down the river, and he chained it to the old sunken ship when the tide was low. Then he waited for the great tidal energies to do their work. Slowly the rising tide, with all the forces of the ocean behind it, came up under the flat-boat, raising it inch by inch. And as it came up, lifted by irresistible power, the derelict came up with it, until it was entirely out of the mud that had held it . . . There are greater forces than those tidal energies waiting for us to use for our tasks.' They operate when we lay hold on them.

There is an apologetic behind 'apologetic.' This is the work of philosophy, which prepares the mind to receive spiritual truths. It spreads an atmosphere and an attitude that give the truths of religion a sympathetic hearing. In the last part of the nineteenth century, *e.g.*, when the influence of Darwin and Huxley had dominated a generation and men's minds were apt to be shut against spiritual conceptions, a great service was done to religion by the Neo-Hegelian school of thinkers, of whom

T. H. Green, Wallace, and Caird are the best known. These were right-hand allies of the Christian faith, and we owe them a deep debt of gratitude.

Our own generation, however, has turned away from this philosophy. By many thinkers to-day it is regarded as a form of pantheism, and the movements represented by Pragmatism, Personal Idealism, Natural Realism, and Creative Evolution witness to this revulsion. We are in a different mental climate, and there is a call for a fresh survey of the great problems if that idealism to which religion always looks for support is to make its voice heard to-day. What form is it taking in contemporary thought?

This is the question raised by Miss Hilda D. Oakeley in her recent work, *History and Progress* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). The book is a collection of essays and lectures on diverse philosophical topics. It is a work of extraordinary ability and interest. The writer deals with the big things with a quiet mastery that shows her quality, and the fact that she keeps so close to reality is perhaps accounted for by her varied experience as both warden of a settlement and teacher of philosophy.

One of the essays deals with the subject 'Time and Eternal Life,' and the conception of the relation of time to eternity found in current idealism. She selects two thinkers, Bosanquet and von Hügel, as representing two aspects of idealist philosophy, the logical and the mystical. What have they to say about this profound problem, the place of time and time-experience in the perfection we call Eternal Life?

Bosanquet rejects both Bergson's conception of a 'creative progress ad infinitum' and also the doctrine of a temporal earthly experience passing at some point into the eternity of the heavenly state. For him time is unreal. It is appearance only, 'but appearance inseparable from the membership of finiteness in infinity, and therefore from the self-revelation of a reality which, as a whole, is timeless.'

Personality fares in the same way. Human personalities are of little account except in the result of their striving. It is the work, not the person, that counts. Miss Oakeley's exposition of Bosanquet makes his system appear like a modern version of Nirvana. The individual is lost in the All. History is a succession of appearances. No doubt the ethic deduced from this has a splendid air about it. It is that man should live for the spiritual goal of high endeavour and be content to be nothing so that the timeless Whole be perfect. What is the soul, after all, but 'a link, or focus, through which the striving of the universe unites the multitude of things and persons in the Absolute Whole'?

Von Hügel's contribution is more helpful. Indeed, his conception of Eternity is a noble and spiritual one. Eternal Life gets its substance from concrete experience. He finds it everywhere, in scientific achievement, in the emotional experiences of life, as well as in religious experience. Eternal Life is made real in temporal events, or its reality is apprehended thus. Yet spiritual perfection seems even in von Hügel to exclude the aspect of succession. Man's progress is by conscious succession of experiences, and he has an ideal of eternity, but 'to complete Eternity he will never attain.'

Miss Oakeley has some penetrating criticisms to make of contemporary idealism. 'The relentless logic which compels the whole (*i.e.* the best) to appear as the final stage of a logical process, rejecting all that does not fit in with its form of universality in difference—time, separate personality, the irreconcilable contrasts of good and evil, teleology and mechanism, does not say much to our deepest experience. . . . We must, therefore, confess, with a deep disappointment, that the latest and in some respects the most ethically impressive and attractive of the utterances of Absolute Idealism does not seem to solve the problem of religious

philosophy.' This is her verdict on Bosanquet, and she adds some definite reasons. The conception of timelessness is a negative and, indeed, an impossible one. The concrete time notion cannot be got rid of. It is the life-blood of reality. If the riddle of existence is to be solved it must be, not by abstraction from all human reality (*e.g.* the consciousness of growth in spiritual experience), but by seizing hold of that reality of which our experience may indeed be the symbol, but a true symbol, not mere illusion.

A truer conception of this reality is found in a philosophy like von Hügel's, where the Eternal is revealed in time and its reality apprehended in the durational experience of the religious life.

A New View of the Servant of the Lord.

By Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., United Free Church College, Glasgow.

It may interest the readers of The Expository Times, who in the present distress find it difficult to get or to keep in touch with foreign criticism, to learn of the latest solution of the difficult 'Servant of Jahweh' problem, proposed by Sigmund Mowinckel, a Norwegian scholar, and enthusiastically adopted by no less an authority than Professor Hermann Gunkel, who has sketched it in a very interesting brochure entitled *Ein Vorläufer Jesu* (Verlag Seldwyla, Bern). The passages round which the discussion turns are the famous songs in Is 42^{1-7} 49^{1-7} 50^{4-11} 52^{13}–53^{12}, dealing with the enigmatic figure of the Servant of Jahweh.

No ambiguity, of course, attaches to the interpretation of the Servant in the body of the prophecy proper (Is 40–55): there, beyond any cavil, he is the nation (41^{8} 44^{1} 45^{4} 48^{20} etc.). But the subject of the Servant songs is a different matter, and their interpretation divides the critical camp, some—perhaps the majority—believing that here, as in the rest of the prophecy, the Servant is the nation (Jacob, or Israel, as he is alternatively called), others vehemently maintaining that, in justice to all the facts, and in particular to the very highly individualized traits of the description, the Servant can here at any rate only be fairly or naturally regarded as an individual. There are excellent scholars on both sides, so that the question cannot be decided either by the numbers or the ability of the disputants, and a new attempt at a solution should be welcome to everybody. I do not propose here to discuss the question on its merits, but simply to present the new view which, briefly stated, is that the Servant is none other than the prophet himself.

The exiles have been languishing in Babylon for half a century, and Deutero-Isaiah comforts them with the assurance that the day of their redemption draweth nigh. This is no vague promise: for in the great Cyrus, who has swept over Western Asia with his conquering hosts, and whose every step is attended with victory (41^{2}), the prophet sees the sure and certain historical agent of that redemption. In this experience the wonders of the ancient Exodus are to be revived, and even surpassed; the whole creation is to join with Israel in the song of jubilation (44^{23} 45^{8}); and the poet-prophet looks forward to the time when all the nations, astonished at Jahweh's doing and ashamed of their own foolish idolatries, will be won to the worship of Israel's glorious God. Now in this magnificent programme let us consider the rôle assigned in the Songs to the Servant.

He has been chosen by Jahweh as His instrument to do *prophetic* work: like Jeremiah, he has been called from his mother's womb (49^{1}). The spirit of Jahweh is upon him (42^{1}), and his mouth is the instrument by which his work is done, the sword by which his battle for Jahweh is fought (49^{2}). He has a disciple's tongue, his ear is open and sensitive to the daily revelation from his God which each new morning brings (50^{4}), and the words of comfort and assurance which he utters to others are the words which he has himself heard from his divine Master, listening, as he does evermore, like a true disciple. Like Paul, he delivers just what he has received. All this, it is argued, does not carry us beyond the range of an individual prophet, who in the name of God can speak an effective and even creative word.

His first commission is to his own unhappy people:

> To bring from the dungeon the captives
> Who sit in the darkness of prison—[1]

the prison of Babylonian exile. To them his word is a promise of freedom. But more. When Jacob is brought back to Jahweh, and Israel gathered to him (49^5), the prophet's task is to 'raise up the tribes of Israel,' that is, to fashion them anew; in this way he becomes a 'covenant of the people,' that is, he concludes and embodies in his own person a new covenant between God and the people. Like a second Moses or Joshua, he is to lead his people out of bondage into the promised land. This, however, is not enough. God, as we have already seen, is yet to be revealed, not only to Israel, but to the world; and this greater programme also is to be achieved through the Servant.

> He (*i.e.* Jahweh) saith, 'It is too light a thing
> To raise up the tribes of Jacob,
> And Israel's dispersed to restore:
> I will make thee a light to the nations,
> That so My salvation may reach
> To the very ends of the earth' (49^6).[2]

So in 42^{1-4} his outlook is upon the distant shores of the world, and foreign kings and princes, accepting his message, will pay him lowly homage as the messenger of the mighty word of God (49^7). Here is a task and a vision greater than that of Moses. Moses' commission was to Israel, this man's to the world. Doubtless Jeremiah, too, had felt himself called to be 'a prophet to the nations' (1^5), but never had any one before dared to claim for himself the homage of the whole world. This daring is so extravagant that it is little wonder, as Gunkel says, that throughout the centuries it has been consistently referred to any subject rather than to the prophet himself; but it begins to be justified when we remember that we have in him one of the very greatest of the human race, and that these daring ambitions are not the effusions of vanity, but the expression of a soul that knows itself to be but the instrument of God, and that the glory he anticipates is not for his own sake, but for Jahweh's (49^7).

But to all this anticipated glory for himself and his people there was a tragic issue. His activity had to be pursued on a humble scale: unlike his mighty predecessors, who lifted up their voices in the public places, he exercised his comforting ministry in quiet and unobtrusive ways ($42^{2f.}$), and in his own personal appearance there was nothing to attract or win men (53^2). No one believed his message; now, as always, Israel was blind and deaf, each going his own way like wandering sheep, indifferent to the prophet's good news of impending deliverance and future glory. Nor did the political situation change so rapidly as in his impatience he had anticipated; he had the sense of having laboured in vain and spent his strength for nought (49^4). Worse still, the people whom he strove to inspire grew suspicious and afraid. What might not the Babylonians do, if they got to hear of the doom with which he threatened their empire? So they sought to silence him by violence, spat upon him, smote him on the back (50^6), despised and rejected him. But, like Jeremiah, he was ever and anon sustained by his God, in whose eyes he was honourable (49^5), and in his whose strength he could endure.

> For the Lord Jehovah doth help me,
> And so I am not confounded;
> I set my face like a flint,
> And I know I shall never be shamed.
> My Vindicator is nigh,
> Who then dare contend with me?
> Who dare be mine opponent?
> Let him draw nigh unto me ($50^{7f.}$).

Unlike Jeremiah, he never breaks out into imprecations upon his adversaries: his resignation amid sorrow and persecution lifts him to a lonely height among the great ones of Israel.

To persecution was added sickness and a bodily suffering which disfigured him so grievously that his contemporaries could only regard him as smitten by the wrath of God, and turned away from him in horror—an experience all the more awful that he was conscious of having been elected to so high a destiny. Yet

> Though outraged, he was submissive,
> He opened not his mouth (53^7).

[1] The quotations are from my *Isaiah in Modern Speech* (James Clarke & Co.).

[2] As $49^{5f.}$ is in some ways the most crucial passage of the Songs, the one which seems most conclusively to distinguish between the Servant and the people, it is only fair to say that with the slight omission of 'that thou shouldest be My servant' in v.[6], which is supported by metrical considerations, advocates of the national interpretation can, without the slightest violence, claim and use this passage in favour of their own view, as they also can 53^8 with a very slight and probable change of text.

His sufferings, he now sees, must end in death, a death made bitter by the thought that no one will care (53^{8}), and doubly bitter by the knowledge that he will be deprived even of an honourable burial (53^{9}); and most bitter of all by the feeling that he dies with his mission unfulfilled.

But again his faith comes to the rescue and lifts him triumphantly over death and the grave. God owes it to him, as Job ($19^{25ff.}$) felt too, to vindicate him before the world. The time will come when the mighty will do him homage, 'and kings shall be silent for awe of him' (52^{15}). But this glory can be his only through his resurrection; yet to this too—in a verse whose text is unhappily very corrupt—he looks forward with serene confidence (53^{10}). So daring a thought is indeed a marvel, especially at the stage which Israel's religious thought had then reached. The prophet is himself very conscious of this, it is something unparalleled in the world's experience:

For what they had never been told shall they see,
They shall gaze upon things unheard of before (52^{15}).

But his God is able to perform even this miracle of raising him again from the dead to justify and glorify him before the world.

But more. The prophet penetrated to the heart of the mystery of his suffering and death, interpreting it as a vicarious offering for the sin of his people—an offering of all the greater worth as it was voluntarily made. Further, he is convinced that this voluntary death will make a saving impression on those for whom he has suffered, and so will accomplish the purpose of God in the conversion of Israel. In the middle of the great poem which foretells his death and resurrection (52^{13}–53^{12}) he has inserted a penitential confession, corresponding to the customary dirge over the dead, and supposed to be sung by the repentant people, after he is risen again to glory. They do not here, as was customary, praise the departed, but they express the sorrow of their hearts at the suffering which he bore and the death which he died for them:

But *ours* was the pain that he bore,
And the sorrows he carried were ours;
Yet by *us* he was counted as smitten
And tortured by God's own hand.
But ours was the sin that pierced him,
The guilt that crushed him was ours:
Yea, *he* was chastised for *our* welfare,
And *his* stripes brought healing to *us*.
We had all of us wandered like sheep,
Each turning a way of his own,
While Jehovah had laid upon *him*
The iniquity of us all (53^{4-6}).

Then the dirge changes to prophecy. The wonderful poem ends with the Servant's unclouded outlook upon his own future exaltation and glory, and with this vision in his heart he goes calmly forward to tread the bitter way of death, sure beyond the shadow of a doubt that the purpose of the Lord will through him be triumphant (53^{10}). Good Friday and Easter morning are here anticipated.

What reader, asks Gunkel in conclusion, can fail to think of that other great Servant of God, the greatest of them all, who was likewise rejected by His people—the Servant who in wonderful wise combined the mightiest consciousness of the greatness of His mission and the uniqueness of His person with humility and meekness, who vanquished the thought of death with the conviction that His blood would be a ransom for many, and with the sure expectation that He would speedily come again in the clouds of heaven? That Jesus should have cherished such thoughts of Himself is surely credible, when we find them entertained more than five centuries before by this great 'Forerunner' of His.

It is not my purpose to criticise this interpretation. At many points I do not find it convincing, and still less when its relation to the book as a whole (40–55) is considered. But readers will admit the attractiveness and skill with which Professor Gunkel has summarized Mowinckel's theory and once again laid all Old Testament students under a heavy debt.

Literature.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

We had all settled down comfortably in the conviction that the question as to how the Synoptic Gospels were composed had been settled, at least in the essentials of the matter. But here is a book, and a competent book too, that challenges the main conclusion of present-day criticism *au fond*. That conclusion is, of course, the 'two-document hypothesis,' that Mark and 'Q' are the main sources of the Synoptic written narrative. 'Matthew' and 'Luke' both used Mark and 'Q,' but were themselves mutually independent. In *The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels*, by Mr. H. G. Jameson, M.A. (Oxford: Blackwell; 6s. net), the author calls for a revision of the whole problem, contending (1) that the Third Gospel is built up on a definite and methodical plan from the Second Gospel and the First; (2) that the First Gospel is prior in date to the Second, which at once abbreviates and embellishes the First; and (3) that there is no reason to postulate any further documentary source, such as 'Q,' which, in point of fact, is a purely mythical creation of the critical imagination.

This looks like putting the clock back; but (as Mr. Jameson suggests) while the clock goes *on*, it has a disconcerting way of going *round*, and on this subject there has been more than one revolution of opinion. Mr. Jameson makes good use of the critical admissions as to the nature of 'Q,' its amorphous and elastic character, its protean changes, its fluidity, and quotes Mr. E. R. Buckley, in his 'Introduction to the Synoptic Problem,' to this effect: 'Indeed the document which by the greatest ingenuity can be constructed out of the common matter in St. Matthew and St. Luke, not found in St. Mark, is such an amorphous thing, and in its contents so unlike anything that anybody is ever likely to have written, that scepticism as to its existence as a separate entity seems wholly reasonable.'

If Mr. Jameson's main contentions are right, however, 'Q' simply fades away into the *Ewigkeit*. It is unnecessary. And therefore, after some chapters of general argument, the author devotes himself to proving that Luke used Matthew and that Matthew is prior to Mark. The whole discussion is conducted in a modest, cautious, and entirely reasonable spirit, and the reasons advanced for the book's position are by no means negligible. It will be impossible to ignore this fresh presentation of the evidence, for it is as scholarly as it is candid, and it is obvious that while one theory may seem to fit the facts, another interpretation of the same evidence may fit them more closely.

The strongest part of this book is precisely the part which needs the strongest reasons, the contention that Mark followed Matthew and used it. This argument as it is presented by Mr. Jameson strikes us as extremely able and persuasive. He points out that Matthew bears the impress of originality, that Mark's use of it is entirely what we should expect, that, if 'Q' be left out of account, the consensus of ancient testimony is much in favour of the priority of Matthew. He asks pertinently why, if Matthew used Mark, he left out all the vivid touches in Mark? and shows how likely it is that Mark, using Matthew, *added* these on the authority of Peter. He deals with the Matthæan 'doublets' and the changes in the order of events, and finally points out that there are passages in Mark which are plainly secondary, and that to explain this phenomenon the supporters of the two-document hypothesis are compelled to suppose that Mark also used 'Q,' which is rather a counsel of despair.

Baldly stated, without the supporting discussion, these points may seem unconvincing. But they may suffice to indicate the wealth of material and suggestion in this scholarly treatise, which has gone over the whole ground and deserves by its merits to receive careful consideration.

FICHTE'S 'REDEN.'

In the revival of the spirit of the German people which had been crushed by the overwhelming disaster of Jena, a notable factor was the 'Reden an die deutsche Nation,' delivered by Fichte in Berlin, 1807–08. They roused the people from their apathy and summoned them to new spiritual tasks. They placed before them a programme for a new system of national education, from the establishment of which Fichte with glowing enthusiasm foretold manifold blessings to the nation. The addresses are worth preservation and will

repay study. We have them here in an exceptionally good translation—*Addresses to the German Nation*, by Johann Gottlieb Fichte, translated by R. F. Jones and G. F. Turnbull (The Open Court Publishing Company; 7s. 6d. net).

They do contain some absurdities, such as the depreciation of all modern languages except German, and the exaggerated estimate of Germany's services to civilization and culture. But when we remember the circumstances and the aim of the orator these are explicable. There are many points worth serious consideration. Some in the Germany of to-day are looking back to Fichte's desire to see 'a State of justice and truthfulness, founded on the equality of all humanity.'

Very interesting are some wise thoughts thrown out almost incidentally. Take this: 'Although it is true that religion is, for one thing, the consolation of the unjustly oppressed slave, yet this above all is the mark of a religious disposition, viz., to fight against slavery and, as far as possible, to prevent religion from sinking into a mere consolation for captives. No doubt it suits the tyrant well to preach religious resignation and to bid those look to heaven to whom he allows not the smallest place on earth. But we for our part must be in less haste to adopt this view of religion that he recommends; and we must, if we can, prevent earth from being made into a hell in order to arouse a greater longing for heaven.'

ZOROASTRIAN ETHICS.

The Maharajah of Baroda and the college there are issuing a series of manuals on the moral teaching of the great religions which are to consist, in the main, of a chain of quotations from the various sacred books. They should form an interesting study, partly by their revelation of how very much of morality is a possession common to all the faiths. The oldest extant book is some 6000 years in age, and yet in very large degree its conception of a moral well-living person is a curiously close approximation to what we still mean by the term, though, of course, it is always possible that we are reading back into the old words a fullness of meaning and a width of application that were not originally there. At all events, what gives the ethics of the several religions their character and distinctiveness is, largely, what they omit, and where they lay the emphasis, and in what order of importance they arrange the various virtues. The series opens with *Zoroastrian Ethics*, by Mr. Maganlal A. Buch, M.A. (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), a quite natural choice, for there are few metaphysical problems to distract one. And yet why is it that there is so little glow about the Zoroastrian ethic? It is all very noble, and extremely thorough, probing down from deeds and words to thoughts. There is a real touch of originality—has any other faith so set itself against asceticism, except 'fasting to sin,' or did even the Greek put greater store on the moral value of physical health, or underline more heavily the sheer joy of life? In many places it stands well to the front—from the beginning women's rights were recognized and largely safe; there was an eight-hours' day inculcated; there is a quite Carlylean rapture over work; Herodotus taught us how vastly truth is prized; there is a love of animals which must, and indeed does, regard the 12th of August as sheer horrid wickedness; the dog especially, usually so little regarded in the East, is here a lovable and loved companion; the world is a mere shadow, all is dust, and wealth a bird that flits from tree to tree, resting on none; charity is an essential ingredient of virtue, one should feed the needy before one eats oneself, and there is nothing better to be done with life than 'to make an enemy a friend, and a wicked man holy, and an ignorant man wise.' It is all deep and true. And yet why is gold so pure somehow so dull and dim, why does it read so formal? The chief thing in any religion is not really its morality, but the power it brings to lay compulsion upon one to live it out.

> The real God function
> Is to furnish a motive and injunction
> For practising what we know already.

And there too Zoroastrianism has a noble and chivalrous appeal. We are free men, whose privilege it is to throw ourselves into the struggle between good and evil on the former's side, knowing that we will surely tell, and certain that the good and true will win at last. That is a right gallant note, yet it has not the winning power of the long sacrifice of Buddha, or the Cross of Jesus Christ; and so these ethics do not reach the heart and move one as the Buddhist and the Christian ethics do. There is an interesting introduction on psychological conceptions and the like, and a full and useful bibliography.

CAPITALISM.

Mr. and Mrs. Webb, the well-known leaders of Fabian socialism, have just published an important book which will have to be reckoned with, whatever be thought of its conclusions. It is *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization*, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Allen & Unwin ; cloth, 4s. 6d. net ; paper, 2s. 6d. net). Towards the close of the book the authors say that, though they have been active members of the Labour and Socialist movement for over thirty years, they have never before framed an indictment of the capitalist system. If this be so, they have certainly now made up for their past omission. The tone and attitude of the present volume remind a reader continually of Karl Marx's 'Capital.' The argument is full of passion and scorn, and the picture of the capitalist system set before us is one of almost unrelieved blackness. With one exception (and not much of an exception at that) the system is rotten, in its character, its results, and in the motives that inspire and maintain it. This representation rather alienates the reader's natural feeling of sympathy and awakens his critical faculty. He feels that a system that has prevailed so widely and been worked by so many men of sound character cannot be so absolutely and completely without merit or defence.

The substance of the argument is admirably summarized in the Introduction. The indictment consists of four counts. First, capitalism inevitably produces poverty. Secondly, it creates inequality of incomes ; comfort at one end, penury at the other, with a class of idle rich. Thirdly, it leads to a glaring inequality of personal freedom, one class working under the orders of another for mere personal gain, which is what is meant by 'wage slavery.' Finally, capitalism has failed in its own object, the production of commodities and services, and by its reliance on the motive of personal gain is inimical to the highest interests of the race, to morality and to peace. This introduction, with the brief statement of the author's case, is very persuasive. You feel when you have read it, 'That is a strong case.' This effect, however, is steadily lessened as you proceed to the detailed exposition. Certain reflexions inevitably rise in the mind as the authors go on. One is that to a great extent they are denouncing human nature and not capitalism. A great part of their scathing denunciation is of things that rich people do. But would any other people do otherwise, given the means, unless they became different kind of people? And that suggests this other reflexion which goes to the root of the matter. The writers seem to assume that, while capitalism is inspired by personal gain as a motive, socialists are inspired by the desire to serve. Is this true? If it were true, we should gladly hand over the reins of government to them to-morrow. We suspect, however, they are just like other people, and that to make socialism possible you must first make men Christian. If socialism were run by unregenerate people, would it produce fruits very different from the present? The capitalist system has grave faults and has many sins to its discredit. But it is being modified and socialized, and the best elements in the socialist system are being gradually incorporated. We may look to a continuance of this process to remove the real evils of capitalism. For it is still true that the inequalities of the present system and the reign of fierce and unchristian competition are evils which the christianizing of the social system must and will clear away.

THE PREMIER EARL OF ABERDEEN.

The Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen, K.G., K.T., Prime Minister during the greater part of the Crimean War, written by Lady Frances Balfour, LL.D., D.Litt. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 2 vols., £2, 2s.), has just been published, more than sixty years after his death. The lives of those who were his principal colleagues—the Duke of Wellington, Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone—and the lives of the Prince Consort and Queen Victoria have all been published. About thirty years ago also there was published the excellent short biography of Lord Aberdeen by his son, Lord Stanmore, in 'The Queen's Prime Ministers' series. The present work, however, is on a different scale. It gives the correspondence of Lord Aberdeen in full, and will prove permanently valuable.

The Earl of Aberdeen's biographer says of him quite truly that he was 'a Minister of Peace if ever there was one. Fate has almost entirely associated him with an unfortunate war'—the Crimean War. Writing after he had been driven from office owing to the horrors of that campaign, Lord Aberdeen says: 'You are quite right in

supposing that I look back with satisfaction to the efforts made by me to preserve peace. My only cause of regret is, when I found this to be impossible, I did not at once retire instead of allowing myself to be dragged into a war which although strictly justifiable in itself was most unwise and unnecessary. All this will be acknowledged some day, but the worst of it is that it will require fifty years before men's eyes are opened to the truth.' No such record of repentance will be found in the Life of the Prince Consort or in that of Queen Victoria.

The Earl of Aberdeen may well have been a Minister of Peace. At thirty years of age he was sent as British representative on a special mission to Vienna to endeavour to bring Austria into the war against Napoleon. In this capacity he was a witness of all the unspeakable horrors of the decisive battles that culminated at Waterloo and the banishment of the man who had devastated Europe from Lisbon to Moscow. In one of his letters from the seat of war Lord Aberdeen writes: 'The near approach of war and its effects are horrible beyond what you can conceive. The shock and disgust and pity produced by such scenes are beyond what I could have supposed possible.' No wonder that Lord Aberdeen as Foreign Minister laboured hard again and again to avert war both in Europe and America.

It is curious to read that almost a century ago the popular sympathy was strongly with the Greeks and with Russia as the enemy of the Porte and the friend of Greece, and that Lord Palmerston asked why the Turks should be maintained at Constantinople, just as so many people are asking to-day. And yet some twenty-five years later Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston had declared war against Russia to keep the Turk in Constantinople!

What blood has since been shed and what treasure wasted in the effort to drive the Turk out of Europe!

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.

Psychology in our day is in some quarters threatening religion pretty much as physical science did in the past. The discovery of the mechanism and the laws of natural processes seemed to make any except a deistic God unnecessary. So writers like Leuba tell us now that, 'in religious lives accessible to psychological investigation, nothing requiring the admission of superhuman influences has been found. There is nothing . . . not a desire, not a feeling, not a thought, not a vision, not an illumination, that can seriously make us look to transcendent causes.'

The fallacy of this reasoning is ably demonstrated by Mr. Robert H. Thouless, M.A., Lecturer in Psychology at the University of Manchester, in *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). The position, he points out, 'makes the unproved assumption that religion would be convicted of falsity, if it could be expressed in terms of known psychological laws.' The book, in its concluding chapter especially, has a strong apologetic interest, all the stronger by reason of its almost extreme caution. The author holds that the truth of religion cannot be proved with mathematical stringency. No one line of proof suffices by itself. But when manifold lines of attempted proof converge and supplement and support one another, a reasonable probability is attained, though the possibility of error can never be reduced absolutely to zero.

In this work we have a perfect store of accurate information and profound thought. We have a careful analysis and evaluation of the factors of religious belief as actually held, and the phenomena of conversion and mysticism are dealt with in illuminating fashion. The chapter on the Herd-Instinct will repay close attention on the part of all interested in revivals.

On the vexed question as to the meaning and value of psycho-analysis we are inclined, on the whole, to recommend the study of *Some Applications of Psycho-Analysis*, by Dr. Oskar Pfister, pastor in Zurich (Allen & Unwin; Eng. trans., 16s. net). The author is a Christian minister, with no mean knowledge of pedagogy, philosophy, and ordinary psychology. He is a convinced follower of Freud, but is quite aware of the exaggerations and defects of some of that master's pupils. His own work is not beyond criticism. His views, we think, are at points open to serious question. His account of artistic inspiration, *e.g.*, is based on the analysis of the mind and work of one neurotic and abnormal subject. No doubt the study of

disease is valuable as a guide to health, but by itself it is not competent to lead to an adequate conception of the functioning of the organism in normal, healthy conditions. That is our difficulty with many writers on psycho-analysis. Their evidence is too predominantly derived from 'sick' cases.

In *The Heart of the Bhagavad-Gita* (Baroda; Rs. 2.4) the Pandit Lingesha Mahabhagavat of Kurtkoti, Ph.D., sets forth and commends the main teaching of this important Hindu Scripture. The aim is to show how thought, devotion, and action should be regulated so as to contribute to the attainment of spiritual peace. At many points interesting parallels to the Christian teaching are indicated. We see clearly that God has never left Himself without a witness. The English of the book is almost unexceptionable. The printing leaves a good deal to be desired.

Three essays by Mr. K. M. Loudon have been collected and published by Basil Blackwell with the title *Two Mystic Poets* (3s. 6d. net). The title is taken from the first essay, which deals with Crashaw and Vaughan. The second essay is a comparison of Tennyson's treatment of the Arthurian Legend with that of Sir Thomas Malory; and the third is an account of Tagore's 'Gitanjali,' in which the author brings out a similarity between its thought and that of Stevenson's poems, the 'Gardener' and the 'Lamplighter.' This essay is called 'East and West.' The three essays were prepared in the first place for a private Reading Club. They do not contain anything very new, but they are pleasantly expressed.

The sane and well-grounded optimist is a boon and a blessing to men. We may affirm, then, that *Hope: Reflections of an Optimist on the Psychology of Holiness, Happiness, and Health,* by A. W. Hopkinson, Vicar of Banstead (Constable; 7s. 6d. net), will be welcome to many. And deservedly. The writer is an optimist, but his confidence is grounded on truth and experience, and he is able to tell us the grounds in pleasant cultured language and with many literary allusions and illustrations to charm us by the way. About 'The Conquest of Disease,' *e.g.*, he has much to say that is sensible. Fear is one of the sources of disease; disease is contrary to the will of God; it can therefore be cured by God; but its cure is intimately connected with being right with God. That is one of his chapters. There are others on the conquest of other evils, and there are chapters on different aspects of the religious life. And it is all good and all leading on to hope, and more than hope—fulfilment, even here.

A volume of the Sermons and Addresses of the Rev. George W. M'Daniel, D.D., LL.D., has been published by the George H. Doran Company ($1.50 net). Dr. M'Daniel ministers to a Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia. The present volume—Dr. M'Daniel has already published a number of other books—is called *Seeing the Best.* The ten sermons which it contains have much illustrative matter in them, and they are distinctly evangelical.

A series of lectures entitled *Puritanism in the Scottish Church* (Paisley: Gardner; 6s. net), delivered in the spring of 1914 in Glasgow University under the Hastie Foundation, by the Rev. W. S. Provand, M.A., are now published in accordance with the terms of the Trust rather than by the wish of the lecturer, if we interpret his preface correctly. As the whole subject has been very fully discussed by leading and misleading historians, essayists, novelists, English as well as Scottish, it was improbable, if not impossible, that any new light would be forthcoming on this first quarter of the twentieth century. It is the aim of Mr. Provand to deal faithfully and impartially alike with Royalist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Covenanter. His lectures appear to have been given under these headings: 'The Church of Knox,' 'The Church of Melville,' 'The Second Reformation,' 'The Extremists,' 'The Revolutionary Settlement,' 'The Aftermath,' and 'The Epilogue.' Mr. Provand seldom fails to quote his authorities. Among the historians he has a leaning to Mr. Buckle, who in his most elaborate 'History of Civilization in England' has a great deal to say of 'The Scotch Intellect during the Seventeenth Century.' He bears this testimony to the character of the Scottish Puritans: 'The war which the Scotch waged against Charles I. partook more of the character of a crusade than any war ever carried on by a Protestant nation. The main object was to raise up presbyters and to destroy bishops. Prelacy was the accursed thing, and that must be rooted out at every hazard. To this all

other considerations were subordinate. This was their first and paramount duty. They fought indeed for freedom, but above all they fought for religion.' Mr. Provand, while admitting that the popular view in Scotland is that 'the Covenanters were in the main incontestably right,' points out that a view being popular is no guarantee of its being correct. 'If what is meant be that the Covenanters were really in possession of the truth in thinking that their Calvinistic theology was the gospel as preached by its founder, and that Presbyterian Church order is the only one acceptable to God, then the verdict is not one that can be justified.' But 'the Covenanters represented a national cause, and in so doing they appeal strongly to Scottish sympathies even to-day.' He is even nearer the truth when he writes in 'The Epilogue' that the Puritan Church in Scotland through all strugglings and perplexities 'clung steadfastly to a twofold faith—faith in the Christian religion as the one and only remedy for the world's ills, and faith in itself as the divinely commissioned minister of that remedy to mankind.'

A new life of Saint Columba has been written by the Rev. T. H. Walker, minister of the United Free Church in Uddingston—*Saint Columba* (Gardner; 3s. 6d. net). In the preface Mr. Walker says that he has attempted in this volume 'to state in plain and straightforward language, free from the elements of legend and superstition, the facts concerning one of the most romantic figures in history. We wish to make our escape from the atmosphere of mystery and so-called "miracle" and to meet the actual Columba in everyday garb. He was a hundred times greater and better than the dream-figure in many of the histories of him would suggest to us.' Mr. Walker has succeeded in making Saint Columba very real, and the story is so simply told that the volume should make an attractive gift book for boys and girls. There are several delightful coloured and black-and-white illustrations.

In July 1921 there was held at Cambridge a gathering, called the Catholic Bible Congress, which proved so helpful to those who attended it that arrangements have been made to carry on an annual summer school of Catholic Studies. Last year the lectures were upon The Holy Eucharist; and here, in a volume entitled *Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist* (Heffer; 5s. net), one has what may be called an official statement of the Roman Catholic view of the Sacrament. It is a valuable thing to have, for, of course, it is a common complaint that Protestants, whether unintentionally or through sheer wrong-headed obtuseness, are apt to misunderstand and to mis-state the doctrine of Transubstantiation. And in truth it is not easy for us to follow. For when we raise objections, we are often told that ours is far too crude and gross a view of what is then refined into something fairly agreeable to our minds; yet, when we suggest this, it is replied that we are omitting what is vital and essential, and with that we seem to be back again at the crudeness and the rest that were ruled out, with the distressing result that what, to those who hold it, is a glorious fundamental seems, to us who don't, painfully material, and a most unhappy spoiling of what is in itself so moving and beautiful. It is, perhaps, too much to say that nothing of that difficulty exists in this new volume. But it is written in a fine spirit, by scholarly men, whose intellectual honesty never allows them consciously to overpress their points, and who state their case with the most obvious desire to be entirely fair. They admit that they would not be greatly worried if some of the Fathers proved to be against them: so much the worse for these particular Fathers. They do not attempt to prove that the great Greeks taught the doctrine of the Real Presence in its present Roman Catholic form, because the question to which that latter was the answer had not in their time fully emerged; confronted with Luke's account of the Supper, they say frankly that they prefer Matthew's and Mark's, and that there is a difficulty in 'taking Luke as a guide in minute details, in regard to which he doubtless never intended to commit himself.' They quite see that St. Thomas Aquinas' teaching on the Sacrament must create difficulties in the minds of scientific men. They never scruple to put in a fact that tells against themselves. But they have not a doubt that in the Fathers one discovers that which, by the natural evolution of the Church's understanding of the faith, grew into their own doctrine as it is to-day. This is a somewhat humbling book, revealing vividly the limitations of these human minds of ours. Father Lattey tells us that the words Christ actually used were probably either *d'na gishmi*, or *den gushmi*, this is My body. Take that as a metaphor and picture, and the quotations given fit, almost without

exception, into that interpretation: regard them as a statement of bare fact, and you, apparently, see that in nearly all the comments on them. There is no doubt that certain of the Fathers, like St. Cyprian, spoke in a way more akin to the Roman view; and others, like St. Augustine, in a manner ill indeed, as a rule, to fit into it; but apparently what we each bring to this study that we see. For, to a Protestant, this book makes the doctrine it is written to uphold still more impossible than ever.

The Way of Vision, by the Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th. (Longmans; 5s. net), is not a book to be discussed. Rather should it be read in a hush of the spirit. Its text is really 'Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God,' and its purpose to show how, through an awed sense of God's seemingly unreasonable love for it ('for love has no reason except itself') and its own growing love for Him, the soul is purified, and so enabled to wade deeper and deeper into God's gracious purposes for it, until it attains to the fullness of the beatific vision. This is a deeply spiritual study, quietly intense in its earnestness, and very practical. In spite of its real simplicity and an aptness in phrasing, some minds may find in it a certain opaqueness. But those with any knowledge of the mystics, or any one who feels the spell of the type of book of which Faber's writings are, perhaps, the representatives best known to Protestants, will feel at home here. There is nothing of Faber's genius, but there is something of the same knowledge, of the same devoutness, of the same passion to help.

A small volume which might very suitably be given to boys and girls who are about to be confirmed has just been written by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D. He calls it *Helps to the Christian Life* (Longmans; cloth gilt, 1s. 6d. net; cloth, 1s. 3d.). The three helps to the Christian life are Prayer, the Bible, and the Holy Communion. Prayer and the Bible are dealt with very shortly by Mr. Gilbert. The treatment of the Holy Communion, on the other hand, occupies two-thirds of the book. It is very clear and practical.

The *Megillat Taanit* is unique in Jewish literature. It is not a narrative. It is a list of certain events, mainly Jewish victories over Syria in Hasmonean times and over Romans in the beginning of the war of Vespasian. The anniversaries of these were kept as semi-festivals of which only a few are still observed. The booklet was written in Aramaic, and in age ranks next to the Scriptures and Sirach. Mr. Solomon Zeitlin has handled it in scholarly fashion—*Megillat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Philadelphia). He offers a solution of the discrepancy of the dates given in First and Second Maccabees and Josephus by a discovery that 'the Palestinian Jews started to reckon the year beginning in Autumn 312 as the year 2 of the Seleucidean era. The First Book of Maccabees follows this method, while the Second counts this year as the first.'

To the considerable library of books dealing with the Arctic regions there has just been added a well-written and attractive narrative, *Among Unknown Eskimo* (Seeley, Service; 21s. net), by Mr. Julian W. Bilby, F.R.G.S. It is otherwise described as 'An Account of Twelve Years intimate Relations with the Primitive Eskimo of Ice-bound Baffin Land, with a Description of their Ways of Living, Hunting, Customs, and Beliefs.' There are numerous and excellent illustrations, and a large scale map of this huge but little known island territory of the Canadian Dominion, situated for the most part within the Arctic Circle. It is described in the Report of the Geological Survey as the third largest island in the world, exceeded in area only by Australia and Greenland. The interior consists of snow-clad mountain ranges rising to 5000 and 6000 feet, and high up on the summits of some of the mountains are vast lakes wherein salmon trout are said to abound. But the salmon fishers have not yet rented those waters though there is an Arctic 'day' of six months' duration. It is the opinion of Mr. Bilby that the Eskimo inhabitants thrive best when left to live their own lives. The marvel is, he writes, that so healthy, hearty, and happy a civilization of its kind could ever have been evolved. Where they have come in contact even with well-meaning white enterprise they have degenerated. 'Everywhere contact with "civilization" has tended so to divorce these children of the North from their natural environment as to initiate their wholesale decline.' This seems a hard saying in the light of the effects of civilization elsewhere. The Eskimo have a decided belief in the soul, and in the existence of various

good and evil spirits. Their conception of heaven is of a land of warmth and sunshine with good hunting and an absence of storms and hard seasons, and of hell as the dark and bitter abode of the submarine Sedna, the enemy of man, who is responsible for bad weather and times of scarcity. This question of their beliefs is fully dealt with.

Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. have the gift more than any other firm of publishers of getting into touch with men who have spent their lives among native tribes, and of encouraging them to give their knowledge of the geography of the country and of the customs and nature of the people to the public. One such volume 'Among Unknown Eskimo' has been noticed above. The second volume is one of a group written by Major C. M. Enriquez on Burmah. This volume Major Enriquez calls *A Burmese Arcady* (21s. net). In it he deals with all the most important Kachin areas in Burmah. The north of Burmah he has already described in 'A Burmese Enchantment,' and the south in 'A Burmese Loneliness.' In *A Burmese Arcady*, after a short introductory account of the history of the Kachins, Major Enriquez describes the part which the Kachin company played during the War in Mesopotamia. The major part of the book is then devoted to the journey which he himself made at the end of the War through all the Kachin areas of Burmah for purposes of recruiting. The account of the success or failure of the recruiting is given at rather too great length for the ordinary reader, and there is naturally a considerable amount of repetition as he passes from one district to another.

But Major Enriquez has a real first-hand knowledge both of the country and of the peoples, and very considerable sympathy with them; and recruiting to him is not only a means of strengthening British war power, but is also a means of educating the Kachin. 'As for schools,' he says, 'more are needed. But the army and the military police are also schools where the youth may be freely educated in all that is essential to manhood. No greater blessing has ever been conferred upon the Kachins than this military employment.' Again he says: 'I am afraid our adventure abroad taught the Kachins to be dissatisfied. I have often heard them speak contemptuously about their villages and even of the Nats. I suppose it is inevitable and in many ways regrettable. But, on the other hand, perhaps it is just as well. One would rather that than see them accept without protest the dirt and disease that mar their homes. On service they used to say: "Duwa, if you keep us so beastly clean we shall all die when we get home."'

In his conclusion the author asks for help for this true-hearted people with their amazingly receptive minds. He is thoroughly persuaded of the possibilities of the Kachin.

This book makes a substantial contribution to the literature which deals with Burmah and its peoples.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has issued two little volumes of devotional and expository studies which may be regarded as complementary or companion books, though each is the work of a different writer. *His Only Son—Our Lord* (cloth, 3s. net), by Gertrude Hollis, contains twenty-seven brief but clear and pregnant meditations on the 'Prayer of the Great High Priest,' as recorded in St. John's Gospel, chap. 17. They are the outcome of a reverent study of the Life of Jesus from the workshop in Nazareth till that hour when He lifted up His eyes to heaven and uttered that wonderful review of His career on earth. In *Words of the Risen Life* (3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. A. H. Finn, we have a series of 'Studies in the Utterances of the Risen Lord' in keeping with the familiar addresses on the 'Words from the Cross.' The criticism that they do not preach 'Jesus and the Resurrection'—do not preach 'Christ Crucified'—is often directed against a section of the clergy and ministers of every denomination. These two volumes, so completely in harmony with the traditions of the S.P.C.K., are for that large section who do preach the Risen Christ.

Another of the publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is entitled *The Presence of God: A Study in Divine Immanence and Transcendence* (3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Canon W. H. G. Holmes, M.A., a member of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. The book is introduced by a Preface written by Bishop Gore, who commends it because it is 'a book from which we may drink truth as from a fountain of real thought. And it is written from no merely intellectual standpoint. The spirit of the book is devotional and in the true sense practical.' This commendation is abundantly justified by Canon Holmes's exposition of a difficult subject. He devotes the first two

chapters to a definition and lucid examination of 'the Divine Immanence' and 'the Divine Transcendence,' 'One God and Father of all, who is over all'; there is transcendence. 'And through all and in all'; there is immanence. When a man says and believes that 'God made heaven and earth,' he declares his faith in a transcendent God; when he says and believes that God fills heaven and earth, he declares his faith in an immanent God. Canon Holmes's intimate knowledge of the religions of India—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Muhammadanism, Jainism—enables him to contrast the attitude towards God of their votaries with the attitude of those who believe that Jesus died and rose again for the salvation of men. 'But for the most part,' he writes, 'natural religion as it is found in India and Africa is a religion of fear. Disaster and catastrophe are being constantly deprecated. The gods are besieged mostly that perils may be averted. No one can live in a non-Christian country without feeling the pathos of this ever-present fear. But when the Christian messenger brings the good news of the epiphany of the Grace of God, that is of the Real Presence of God granted in the New Way by the Incarnation, he brings not primarily a message of deliverance but a message of salvation.'

We have had in recent times a great many admirable biographies of modern missionaries, and we are apt to think of missionary enterprise as a purely modern affair. But the missionaries to whose labours the conversion of Europe was due are fully as well worth commemorating. Perils, hardships, and privations were their ordinary experience, and the story of their spiritual exploits is one of the most wonderful in history. It is to tell this story that the series 'Lives of Early and Mediæval Missionaries' has been projected, and the latest volume is on *Willibrord: Missionary in the Netherlands, 691–739*, by the Rev. A. Grieve, D.Phil. (S.P.G.; 4s.). It is an admirable piece of work, scholarly and thorough, but also popular and engrossing. Willibrord became a missionary in response to the feeling that the lands from which our people who were won to the faith had come should also hear the gospel. He was English-born, and, without much doubt, may be looked on as the first English foreign missionary. Dr. Grieve's fascinating biography of this early saint and pioneer is as welcome as it is competent.

Notes on the Revelation of St. John: The Symbols as seen in the light of History, 1922, by Mr. P. P. Cutchey (Elliot Stock; 1s.), pretty well explains itself. It is another of the publications which regard the Bible, or at least prophecy, as a sort of programme of the history of the world. One sentence will disclose the nature of the book: 'The grievous sore [on the Beast] was the French Revolution.'

A distinctly timely book has been written, at the request of the Student Christian Movement, by Dr. A. Herbert Gray. The title is *Men, Women, and God* (cloth, 4s. net; paper, 3s. net)—a discussion of questions of sex addressed to both men and women. It is written in the belief that the sexual elements in humanity, once they are rightly understood and truly handled, enrich human life, increase health and efficiency and heighten joy. 'I believe,' says Dr. Gray, that 'nothing is more necessary for the world to-day than that we should trace out the ways in which this tremendous life force that is implanted in us all may be used to forward the higher ends of our common life, and to help the race on its upward march.' That is the purpose of the book. The titles of some of its chapters will show its scope. They are 'Knowing the Facts,' 'Comradeship,' 'Falling in Love and Getting Engaged,' 'Our Moral Standards,' 'A Man's Struggle,' 'Prostitution,' 'The Art of Being Married,' and 'Forgetting the Things which are Behind.' The volume is enriched by the addition of a brief sketch of some of the physiological facts written by the author's brother—A. Charles E. Gray, M.D.(Ed.).

We are familiar with the group system of studying the Bible, from the books published by the Student Christian Movement (a very good example is Mr. Oldham's 'St. Mark') and from Dr. Fosdick's books. One of the most expert exponents of this method is Mr. Harrison Elliott, formerly Bible Study Secretary and later Editorial Secretary of the International Committee of the Y.M.C.A. Mr. Elliott's position in the educational and religious world is shown by his appointment last October to succeed the well-known Dr. Coe as Professor of Religious Education in Union Seminary. The Association Press, New York, has sent out an example of his work on group discussion in *How Jesus met Life Questions*. The topic of each

chapter is stated in its modern form. There is a brief introduction indicating its nature, then follow relevant passages, printed in full in Moffatt's translation. Then come suggestions for personal study, and finally questions for group discussion. It is an admirable scheme, and nearly all big modern questions are included in it, both religious and social. Examples of these are: 'What do the people of the world want?' 'How shall we treat other races?' 'What is a fair income?' 'What good does it do to pray?' This is a little book with great possibilities of influence.

The Student Christian Movement has just issued the fifth edition of *A Child's Bookshelf*, by Miss Lilian Stevenson (3s. net). This is a very excellent bibliography, and the fact that it has gone through several editions shows that it has met a real want. The present edition has been brought up to date by a new section on Plays and Acting.

A group of earnest men who agree on the fundamentals of life have been producing a series of books which they call 'The Christian Revolution' series. The latest volume (the seventeenth) is by one of their leading minds, Mr. Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A., and is called *The Christian Revolution* (Swarthmore Press; 7s. 6d. net). Perhaps the simplest way to indicate the contents would be to say that the standpoint is pacifist and the tone and attitude those of the 'Friends.' The writers of these books all occupy an 'advanced' position on social problems. They deprecate, however, the use of force and advocate the way of love as the solution of all questions and the way to all success in home, school, church, nation, and world. Interpreting religion in a broad Quaker sense, Mr. Hodgkin holds that in religion lies the way out. All social reforms have begun in a religious movement, and 'it is a vain thing to sketch out a possible method of social progress if there be no adequate dynamic to carry it forward.' The dynamic is faith, then, and its way is love, and love is to be exhibited and spread by individual lives. 'Ours is the task of building up little islands where humble service is rendered in the spirit of Christ . . . where we dare to risk all in order to bring love into every relationship.'

The Differentia of the Gospel according to St. Luke.

By the Reverend John A. Hutton, D.D., Glasgow.

Luke, we are told, was a physician. It is a very remarkable thing that so many physicians or doctors have been such admirable writers. Sir Thomas Browne, the philosopher-physician of Norwich, gave the world the imperishable *Religio Medici*. In another medium, John Brown's *Rab and his Friends* has its own niche in the gallery of immortal things of the mind. In our own day Dr. Paget has written two books for youths and maidens—*I Wonder* and *The Young People*—which for wisdom, knowledge, charm, are beyond all praise. For men and women in the thick of the fight, there is also his *Confessio Medici*, which need not fear comparison with the kindred masterpiece of the seventeenth century. Then, of course, there is Oliver Wendell Holmes, also a physician, and a creator, as it were by the way, of books that will live and be loved so long as there are toiling men who in the evening cherish an hour of fruitful leisure.

It would appear, indeed, as though the very qualities that go to the making of a good physician go also to the making of a good writer—good spirits that enable a man to impart brightness to a patient, thereby bringing him on the way to recovery; sympathy, pity, a final kindness of the heart which will always see something more than the grim temporary facts of the case; faith which sees the health that may be coming when the uninformed eye might see only the heartless ravages of a disease; the fighting instinct which he has daily to summon wherewith to arrest the approach of some malady. And with all these things that may be credited to himself—the deep compassion for his fellow-men which must become the very habit of mind of one whose calling acquaints him so persistently with the ills that flesh is heir to. These, which are the qualities of a good physician, are surely the very qualities of good writing. For a good book, I take it, and the human race in the long run agrees, is a

book which is bathed in a final kindness towards the human race. A good book is a book that will not mock man, that will not accentuate disproportionately the things which turn man against life. A good book rather is a book which disposes man to face wind and weather in the name of something in his own spirit, a sense of honour, a dream, a faith in that Friend behind phenomena whom man names God, whom, with the authority of Christ, he names Father.

Luke also had a qualification for great writing on deep things such as has been shared by all great interpreters of life—*he was not a mere writer. He did something in the world besides writing.* There he is like Thucydides, who was an admiral; Sophocles, who was a soldier; Dante, who 'fought with beasts' in Florence; Leonardo da Vinci, who was an engineer; and in earlier days, Paul, who was a tent-maker; and, to take one case from the Old Testament, Amos, who was a herdsman. Tolstoy declares that there are five conditions which any man must fulfil who presumes to speak to his fellowmen about God: one of the five is that *he shall have wrought with his hands.* For a mere writer is a mere spectator of life; and life is the one game in which the mere spectator sees nothing. Luke was one of those who did something for his fellows, therefore he could write.

And now let me put down some of the things which differentiate the Gospel of St. Luke from the others, and give it its own wonderful distinction. I propose simply to suggest matters, points of view, ideas such as students even with nothing but the text before them may follow very happily; for it is what we find for ourselves that we are apt to communicate to others with the greatest zest.

His Gospel alone begins with an Introduction. He tells us that there were many stories of the life of Jesus in circulation, with some of which, and probably with something in all of which, he was not quite satisfied. Here a teacher might with great profit acquaint himself with those sayings of Jesus unrecorded in the Canonical Gospels, which of recent years have been unearthed from the rubbish heaps of Oxyrhynchus (cf. Hunt and Grenfell, Dr. Milligan, Dr. James H. Moulton). That there were many such sayings afloat we know from explicit statements like that of Luke; and also from such a casual reference by St. Paul to a saying of our Lord's: 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'

But it is, of course, the substance of this Gospel which is the subject of study; and in particular it is the 'intention' or scope of the Gospel which we are to make clear to ourselves.

Now that intention or scope is everywhere most obvious—one sees it in what Luke does *not* record which the other Evangelists have preserved; and equally in what he does record which they had already given; also in what he alone records. That intention or scope, in a word, is—that the gospel of Jesus Christ is a world-message, given to the Jews indeed, but to them only as the instruments, agents, vessels, of a world-constituency.

It is probably the very truth of the matter, that Luke received his spiritual illumination through the ministry of Paul. He certainly has Paul's accent and emphasis. With him also Christ's kingdom has the world for its range. It is to 'St. Luke' therefore that one might go even in a hurry to find a text or an illustration to support internationalism, or brotherhood; and to withstand or rebuke any narrowness in Church or State, any spiritual pride, or bitter nationalism or provincialism. 'St. Luke' is a treasury of sayings and incidents to the effect that 'we are not our own,' that our one business here in this world is to widen the bounds of the City of God. And so, whatever Luke will omit, which another Gospel records, he will not forget to tell the story of the Syrophenician woman—a story the whole point of which struck so deeply into the heart of the hard nationalism of the chief priests and rulers that they began to plan our Lord's death. Again and again that note is struck. Again and again also the point is made that this 'charity towards all' lay all the time at the heart of the Jewish religion as God had given it, and not as men had corrupted it. You might indeed say that it is one of the great assertions of 'St. Luke,' that there was a Cross in the Godhead from all eternity.

The pitifulness of Christ, too, towards all, irrespective of creed or birth or training, who are in distress, in pain, defeated, humbled, alone, is a pervading note of this Gospel. The four blessings in 'St. Luke' are followed by four woes, pronounced on the rich, the satisfied, the scornful, and the outwardly respectable—in this giving a somewhat different tone to the same group of sayings in 'St. Matthew.'

The beautiful birth-stories too which Luke records have, without perhaps intending it, the same effect upon our minds. It is not to the sophisticated, not to those who are at ease in life, that the Good News of the Divine birth is given. It is to simple shepherds—men face to face with nature; to students who then, as now, would in all likelihood be poor men.

And what a gallery it is—and yet not crowded though the space is so small—in which we have the description of the opening of Jesus' ministry in the Synagogue at Nazareth, the stories of the Widow's Son of Nain, of Mary and Martha, of Zacchæus, and, in my own view, most of all worthy of study because unique, of 'the journey to Emmaus.' For surely in that Emmaus-story we are being asked to see the working of the human soul in what is its most difficult achievement, namely, *letting go one hold of truth in order to take a deeper hold.*

And then—to continue our walk round the amazing gallery—here we have 'The Good Samaritan'; 'The Prodigal Son' (or rather as we should say, 'The Loving Father'—for surely it is the Father who is the hero of that story); 'the Rich Man and Lazarus'; 'the Pharisee and the Publican.' In every case, the lesson which is being urged is surely this, that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are His ways our ways; that

> There is a wideness in God's Mercy
> Like the wideness of the sea.

Students of this Gospel and teachers will find it profitable also to note how in 'St. Luke' hints of human limitation to our Lord's powers, such as 'St. Mark' observes, are no longer referred to. To Luke, who had seen, doubtless in the company of Paul, the power of Christ triumphing over the ancient and encrusted evil of human hearts, the unclean being not only forgiven but made clean and fresh (to Luke), Christ has now all power, and is without qualification hailed as 'Son of God.'

But even this higher adoration of Jesus, this derivation of Him from the bosom of God, is always used in 'St Luke' to drive home his one great message, that *God is like that; and we must be like that.* For Luke, we may be sure, would not have quarrelled with the saying that we men have no right to praise God for anything which we ourselves in our measure are not ready to do.

And so, it is in this Gospel we hear the words, 'Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful.'

But everywhere in this Gospel, it is as though we heard the voice of the Macedonian, the voice from the great outside world, 'Come over and help us.' How otherwise are we to put to its deepest use such a story as Lk 5^{1-5}? Surely that story is not only true in a historical sense. Surely it is one of those stories of which our Lord declared that His disciples would never understand the meaning until He had gone, and until life had driven them in upon their memories. What is that story? Let me recall it as I close; for in my view it is itself, in miniature, the whole 'Gospel according to St. Luke.'

Our Lord came upon His disciples in the grey of the morning. They had failed. They knew and confessed they had failed. They had failed in a matter on which they might well suppose they were sure of their ground. They were fishermen, and, with all their inherited wisdom, they had caught nothing. Whereupon Jesus came upon them—once more in the grey of the morning when we are most apt to be disheartened at our task, and when, under the silence of the night and the cold aloofness of the stars, we mortal men are apt to shrink from the Great Assertions and Claims of faith. And what did Christ do to these men who had failed? He sent them back to their tasks; but He added something. 'Launch out into the deep,' He said.

Go into the whole matter of religion, of duty, of faith in God *more deeply.* Follow things backwards and inwards and outwards. Launch out! Let go! Lift your anchors! Dare the utmost for the highest! What is true for you is true for everybody. What is true for the Jew is true for the Gentile. It is things on the surface that dishearten us, that divide us—localisms, nationalisms, and the rest. Beneath the surface we begin to come together. As we make for the centre, we become aware that there are many with us on our quest. If there ever was one Christian, there will be others, and there will be many. Christ's business is never in shallow waters; but always 'in the deep'—among the mysteries and the necessities and the griefs. Out among these, cast your line again, and—take care: your little ship will be laden to the gunwale, and if you do not cry for help you will be drowned in the response from the side of God in human hearts.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Long Face about Nothing.[1]

'I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things *which happened* unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel.'—Ph 1^{12}.

Do you remember we had a little talk, you and I—at least I did all the talking and you did all the listening—about those little glass tubes they found on a London street, and all the fuss and worry there was over them? For people said they were full of the germs of terrible diseases, and anybody might have got them, because somebody had so carelessly left these dangerous things lying about. And yet it turns out that it was all rubbish. The tubes, it seems, weren't filled with germs at all, only with medicine; they couldn't have made anybody ill, but might have made them better: and all the fuss was nonsense, and all the excitement fudge. So let us learn two things, and see that we never forget them. Here is the first. Get it firmly into your memory, with the prepositions that govern the accusative, and those that take the ablative, and those that have sometimes the one and sometimes the other, for this is even more important. Don't believe a thing is bad until you are sure. Of course, there are some things you know are bad, and there is no doubt at all about them. It is bad to tell a lie, it is bad to disobey mother, it is bad to be cross and grumpy and selfish, always bad. But don't put a bad meaning into things unless you are certain, for you may be quite wrong. Paul tells us that he thought he was having a very hard time of it, that everything was going against him; and yet he found that what he took to be hindrances were really helps, what seemed to pull him up gave him a lift on. So he was ashamed that he had put a bad meaning into what was really wise and right and good. You know how annoyed you are when other people do that kind of thing to you. You come home on a Friday, fling your books into the corner, are so happy that Saturday is nearly here that you go whistling and racketing through the house. And mother comes out holding her head and says, 'How noisy you are!' Yet you are not noisy, only in good spirits. Or the master at school says, 'You are just a lazy fellow!' Yet you are not lazy. The trouble is you have so many things to do, and want to get at them all, and all at once, and that's not being lazy. If he had as exciting a book as you, he too might find it hard to stop reading it! If he had as good a collection of stamps, wouldn't he want to take them out and look at them? If he had a new electric torch, wouldn't he like to flash it about on things? The trouble is that the world is so interesting you get lost among all the things you want to be at. But that isn't being lazy, even though your lesson wasn't really very well learned. Well, but if they were wrong about you, if the people were all at sea about those tubes, you can be wrong too. The other day I saw three girls wagging their heads, and one of them was saying as she passed, 'I'm quite sure it was just because Mary Jane is a stuck-up thing!' Well, I don't know Mary Jane, nor what it was all about. Perhaps she had passed them on the road and not noticed them, and they were hurt, and thought her too proud to know them out of school, because she lives in a bigger house than they do. But it mayn't have been that at all. Perhaps Mary Jane was thinking about something, or perhaps Mary Jane has short-sighted eyes, or maybe Mary Jane was going a message and was repeating it over and over that she might not forget it, as she did the last time; like a girl I know who got hers mixed up and couldn't see why the butcher laughed when she asked for 'a pound of shoulder steak off the leg'; or another who wanted 'a mound of pince.' Why were they so sure that Mary Jane was stuck-up, when it really may have been whole heaps of other things? Or are you certain that boy really tripped you in the playground? May you not have tripped over his foot without him meaning anything, the merest accident? Don't put a bad meaning into things till you are sure. There were some people who did not like Jesus Christ; they even said, because He went with poor sinful folk, that He was a bad man Himself. 'For look at the company He keeps,' they cried. But now every one despises them for their nasty, unclean, suspicious minds, knows that Jesus went with these people because in His kind way He wished to try to help them; and that He really was far the best man

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

that ever lived. After all it wasn't germs that were in these tubes, as people said, but only medicine.

Don't put a bad meaning on things till you are sure. Have you got that in your memory? Then here is the second thing. Remember that lots of things aren't nearly as bad as they look, are often just nothing at all, though you are quite afraid of them. Take going to the dentist's. What a row you make about it before you go, and yet you come back saying it was nothing after all! Of course not. Or there's the doing of your hair. You get quite 'teary' at the thought of it; and, though mother promises it won't be bad, are certain it will be dreadfully tuggy and knotty and sore. And yet it really isn't bad. Or there is going to bed. Some of you don't mind, though you like to sit up as long as you can. But when you have to go, you march away quite happily. But some of you hate the dark and are afraid of it, and the stairs and the silent house, and the long passage; you don't feel happy till you reach the lighted room. That's all right. But when the light goes out, you don't like that either; you see things, or hear things, or imagine things that aren't one bit nice. Stevenson felt like you. You remember his poem:

All round the house is the jet-black night;
It stares through the window-pane;
It crawls in the corners, hiding from the light,
And it moves with the moving flame.

Now my little heart goes a-beating like a drum,
With the breath of the Bogie in my hair;
And all round the candle the crooked shadows come
And go marching along up the stair.

The shadow of the balusters, the shadow of the lamp,
The shadow of the child that goes to bed—
All the wicked shadows coming, tramp, tramp, tramp,
With the black night overhead.

But who told you all that nonsense about the kindly darkness, that puts us to sleep and rest and keeps us well, as we couldn't be without it? And why ever are you afraid of it? Ghosts, what? But there aren't any ghosts. There is only God in it, the dearest, kindest, nicest person who could possibly be there. You know when you are lying wakeful in the dark, and mother comes up the stair with a light. You can see it through the crack under the door, getting bigger and brighter, till she comes in, and then you're not a bit afraid, for she is there. But when she goes, and the light gets smaller and disappears at last, you start it all over once more, the seeing things, the hearing things, and all the rest of it. But why? You aren't really alone. For God is there, far kinder even than mother. And the dark isn't awful, but very friendly, and there is nothing dreadful in it, only your dear Heavenly Father who will sit beside you all the time. Afraid! Why ever should you be? How silly!

And so with heaps and heaps of things: they aren't anything like as bad as you think. It wasn't tubes of horrible diseases to make folk ill, it was only medicine to cure them.

Are you a Dodo?[1]

'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'—Gal 6^2.

When I was a young man I used to live in Liverpool; and on the wonderful river yonder there used then to be more ships coming and going than anywhere else, I suppose, in the whole world; not only steamers by the dozen, but many sailing ships as well, beautiful creatures with their graceful lines and tall tapering masts, and white sails gleaming and glinting in the sun, that made the steamers passing them look squat and fussy and vulgar. But there are none now: the last time I was down in Liverpool I don't think I saw any. There are no lovely clippers racing one another from Scotland, as they used to do, to India and China and Japan, and back again. They have all been raced off the seas, because steamers are faster and surer, and can do the work better. And in this busy world there is no room for old-fashioned things that have got out of date. And so the sailing vessels are all gone. But do you know how it happened? It was all the work of a man with no arms. He had been a soldier, had got badly wounded, and yet he had to make his living somehow. And he thought he would be a ferryman. But how could he be that with no arms? Well, he managed, rigged up the oars so that when he put his feet against them and thrust out his legs, the oars rose

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

and came back a bit, and when he drew in his feet again the oars fell into the water and slid back to the first position. And so the boat moved, slowly and clumsily, but it moved. That was rather clever, wasn't it? You boys like to be handy. Well, here is something for you to think about. Can you be as handy, with two hands to be handy with, as this man was handy with no hands to be handy with? It's fairly difficult to be handy with nothing but feet! But, anyway, what happened? One day a great engineer came down to the ferry, and as he watched the man he said to himself, 'Now there is an idea. If I could get steam to move a propeller back and forth, as that man is doing with his legs, I could drive steamers across the seas twice as fast as ships go now.' And he thought and thought until at last he thought it out, and changed the whole world. But really it was all the work of a man with no arms!

But that's nothing. There was once a boy as small as you, who lived in a Highland village. You and I would have thought He would not come to anything particular, for His people were too poor to send Him to college, and He was going to be just a country carpenter. And He lived a boy's life, just like yours. He too had to rise of a morning when He sometimes felt sleepy, and had to bundle off to bed at nights when the time came, though He wasn't one bit tired; and there was school, and there were lessons, and messages, too, to run—a life just like yours. But He lived it all in a new way, so new that it has changed the world. For people said, If I stick to the old-fashioned way of doing things, with this far better way made possible, I'll get completely left behind, I'll be quite out of date. The old way was the savage way, though many people who weren't savages stuck to it. The savage's way is to bear no burdens, to let other people carry theirs, and his too. When a savage is on a journey, he heaps all his goods on to his wife, who goes crawling along half-doubled underneath it all. But he carries nothing, strolls along with his hands in his pockets, if he has got any pockets to put his hands in; or wishing he had, if he hasn't. There is a comic story of some British Tommies who, somewhere in the East, came on a man riding in state, and his wife tramping behind him. 'Sonny,' they said, 'it's time you came down and gave the old lady a chance,' and they pulled him off and set her up; and a very frightened woman rode for once, and a very sulky man carried the goods for once. What happened when the Tommies left them I don't know, but I have my fears! The savage way is to have a good time and not bother about other people, to make them carry for you everything you can, and carry nothing for them at all. Dr. Donald Fraser, the great missionary, tells how some one from a mission station was bathing in Lake Nyassa when a crocodile seized him, and, instead of plunging to the bottom, swam along the surface holding him in his mouth. And the man screamed to those on shore, 'Save me! save me!' And they came down and put their hands to their eyes and looked out over the waters. 'It's none of our people,' they said, and drew up their boat, and went their ways. But Christ's way is to help every one, and to spend one's life for others, and to carry as many burdens as one can get on one's back, as in a long march in France I've seen a young officer, when the men were tired and footsore, carrying two or three packs and a couple of rifles. That's the way to make the most of life; the old selfish way is out of date, like a sailing vessel that goes crawling about only to find that the steamers have nipped in before it at every port and taken all the trade. Now which is your way, the old or the new, the savage's or Christ's? I know that savages aren't altogether selfish; they think of their families and friends a bit. And I know you're not altogether selfish either. Selfishness won't do. At football if a boy sticks to the ball and tries to break through every time on his own, he will soon be put down into a lower eleven or fifteen; you must play for the side and be unselfish; and you know that, and do it there.

But do you live always like that, like Jesus Christ, who spent every day trying to help all kinds of people? Look at your day. You waken, and there are your clothes waiting for you; someone has been thinking of you. And perhaps you don't like that very much, for the fresh flannels are itchy and scratchy a bit, still there they are. And you want breakfast, and there it is ready for you; some one has been bearing your burden, for you didn't get it for yourself. You go to school, and when you come home there's dinner; some one has been at work for you; you go out to play, and come in hungry again, and there's tea; you get sleepy, and 'I'm off to bed,' you say, and there is bed, cosy and clean and comfy and waiting. Always some one is carrying your burdens for you. But what about you; are you helping any one at all,

or just taking it, like a savage, and forgetting to help, as was Christ's way? Think of His day! I fancy He would get up early as a wee chap, and give a help in the house; and before going to school He would get the water from the well, could do that for His mother; and on the way to school He would call for that new boy who was feeling strange, and at games He would pick some one who was never picked until the very end, to encourage him a bit; and in the evening He would help in the workshop; and at night, when His mother was tired, get the wee ones round Him, and tell them those wonderful stories He could make. He was the happiest little fellow in the village, I'm quite sure; and that because He was always helping somebody. And if you are living in the old way, the savage way, the out-of-date way, why, you ought to be put in a museum under a glass-case. And people will come and squeeze their noses flat against it, and say, 'Whatever dreadful kind of beast is this?' And they will read the label—'This ugly creature, thought to be long extinct, was discovered at' (where is it you stay, London, Edinburgh, Glasgow? well, was discovered there) 'in 1923. It is hoped that this hideous beast will soon die out.' Don't you think that would be a sorry end for you? Far better live in Jesus' way, not selfishly, but carrying other people's burdens, in the new, true, proper, happy way. For you really aren't a 'Dodo,' but a girl or a boy.

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Easter

Victorious Faith.

'This is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith.'—1 Jn 5[4].

1. What shall we expect to follow? What does '*this*' represent? Does it stand for perfect self-control acquired after many years of severe self-discipline? Does it represent a kind of self-culture secured through perpetual crucifixion of vicious ways, and the continual cultivation of pleasant pursuits? '*This*' is the victory; is it the quality of myriad-mindedness? Is it the special endowment of natural gifts and graces which make right easy and wrong difficult? Nay, the secret of victory is not to be found in any or all of these things. 'This is the victory that hath overcome the world, *even our faith.*'

Gibbon ascribed the triumph of Christianity to five causes. They were: (1) The inflexible, and, if we may use the expression, the intolerant zeal of the Christians, derived, it is true, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which, instead of inviting, had deterred the Gentiles from embracing the law of Moses. (2) The doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important truth. (3) The miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church. (4) The pure and austere morals of the Christians. (5) The union and discipline of the Christian republic, which gradually formed an independent and increasing State in the heart of the Roman Empire.

But these causes are only, as he called them, secondary causes. Those five reasons or causes are nothing more than five different expressions or creations of a spirit of life and power behind themselves. They mark certain places in the region of thought and in the region of moral practice where the new Spirit from God came into contact with the natural and social order of those days. But by themselves they could have effected nothing, had it not been that behind them and within them there surged and beat an elementary Power.

What was the force behind those men, and behind those beliefs and that discipline, which gave to them their overcoming power? To such a question there is but one answer; and it is this. Just as behind those waves which in a rising sea overcome all oppositions there is the inexhaustible might of the sun, moon, and stars; just as a tide owes its triumph to the fact that it is in obedience at the moment to the whole nature of things, in harmony with physical omnipotence: so the triumph of Christianity in those first days, and in any days when Christianity honourably triumphs, is due and can be due to nothing except this—that at such a time, by the peculiar disposition under God of certain human hearts, at the call of some new moral sensitiveness and spiritual necessity, there was let loose upon the world a Power for holiness, for suffering, for patience, for gratitude, which found a scarcely hindered way.

To explain the progress of Christianity as due to this or that expression or method of Christianity, and to suggest that by the mechanical adoption of those expressions and methods the Church in our own day might at once resume her conquering

career, is as though you were to explain the grinding of corn in a mill by the arrangement of its wheels, and were to omit that flow of concentrated and passionate water which turns the wheels and sustains the movement—water which receives its power by virtue of its descent from a higher plane.

2. It is, of course, true on the other side that this power from God in Christ which fulfilled itself in Christianity and overcame the world was not something which existed as a pure idea and *in vacuo*. It had to come into contact, and indeed it insisted upon coming into contact, with the world-forces and world-systems, and these determined the kind of outward appearance which the conflict between the two should assume.

Christianity can never be entirely separated from its own manifestations in word and life. Just as we have no experience of a spirit without a body, so we have no knowledge, and can have none, of truth, except in conflict or correspondence with the actual world. The efficacy of Christ in the world is demonstrated still and always by the vitality and distinction of the personalities whom He creates, and by the changes and revolutions which His Spirit makes inevitable in our human arrangements.[1]

Commissioner Railton of the Salvation Army wrote: 'The faith of these people, familiar as they are with God, seems to me to be only the faith of a baby—charming, demonstrative, fleeting; the faith that claps its hands and crows when mother presents a lump of sugar at nine inches distance, but screams the moment she draws it a foot or two back. It is not the faith of a *man*, settled, calm, desperate, unmovable, which confides to the end in a love ever so diligently concealed and opposed, and *wins*. I will go on trusting in God. He will do in me and by me all He can, and without any pressing; He knows I expect it.' '*In me and by me*,' he says. Faith to him meant that which overcame 'the world' within and 'the world' without.

Another illustration is found in the life of William Penn—indeed, he made this text peculiarly his own after being 'exceedingly reached' when he heard Thomas Loe preach from it.

(1) 'The Lord first appeared to me,' he says, in his *Journal*, 'in the twelfth year of my age, and He visited me at intervals afterwards and gave me divine impressions of Himself. He sustained me through the darkness and debauchery of Oxford, through all my experiences in France, through the trials that arose from my father's harshness, and through the terrors of the Great Plague. He gave me a deep sense of the vanity of the world and of the irreligiousness of the religions of it. The glory of the world often overtook me, and I was every ready to give myself up to it.' But, invariably, the faith that overcometh the world proved victorious. In his monumental 'History of the United States,' Bancroft says that, splendid as were the triumphs of Penn, his greatest conquest was the *conquest of his own soul*.

(2) It was by his faith that William Penn obtained his second great triumph—his *conquest of the world without*. He disarmed nations by confiding in them. He bound men to himself by trusting them. He vanquished men by believing in them. It was always by his faith that he overcame.

When his father died, the nation was in his debt to the extent of sixteen thousand pounds. This amount—on its recovery—Sir William bequeathed to his son. In due time the matter was compounded, William Penn agreeing to accept an immense belt of virgin forest in North America in full settlement of his claim. He resolved to establish a new colony across the seas under happier conditions than any State had ever known. It should be called Pennsylvania; it should be the land of freedom; its capital should be named Philadelphia—the City of Brotherly Love. He was reminded that his first task would be to subdue the Indians. The savages, everybody said, must be conquered; and William Penn made up his mind to conquer them; but he determined to conquer them in his own way. He approached the chiefs unarmed; and they, in return, threw away their bows and arrows. Presents were exchanged and speeches made. Penn told the natives that he desired nothing but their friendship. He undertook that neither he nor any of his friends should ever do the slightest injury to the person or the property of an Indian.

'His character always triumphed,' says Bancroft. 'His name was fondly cherished as a household word in the cottages of the old world; and not a tenant of a wigwam from the Susquehannah to the sea doubted his integrity. His fame is as wide as the world: he is one of the few who have gained abiding glory.'[2]

[1] J. A. Hutton.

[2] F. W. Boreham, *A Handful of Stars*, 15.

3. To-day the answer to the question, What will give the individual Christian or the Church the victory? is the same—'Faith.' A complete abandonment of ourselves to God, at all cost, and in face of every risk, will change our lives, our outlook, our service, and our influence in the world. Such faith will livingly unite us to Christ. It will make us, and all we have, His. Reciprocally it will make Him, and all He has, ours. For us to live will be Christ. This is the only key to the present situation, the open secret to the spiritual power that will bring inspiration and revival, achievement and triumph equal to those of any age since Pentecost.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Good Shepherd.

'I am the good shepherd.'—Jn 10^{11}.

Down the wide street they press and flow
With a rustling, hurrying, gentle sound,
As of crispèd, withering leaves that blow
Over a frosty ringing ground.

With golden, stupid eyes the sheep
Surge by in waves of dirty grey;
The clamorous mongrels snarl and keep
Their going to the middle way.

And as the acrid smell of wool
Stings in my nostrils, once again
The frostbound thoroughfare is full
Of ghosts of vanished shepherd-men;

Grey-eyed philosophers whose years
Were full of tinkling bells of rams;
Whose deepest thoughts and gravest fears
Were for the little new-born lambs.[1]

Do not despise the shepherd-folk. There have been great souls among them, and their trade is one of the oldest in the world; so, when we begin to track out the antecedents of the thought in Christ's words, we come upon the roots of history. We see Abraham and Lot coming out of the dim distance with flocks and herds so great that they have to divide their new inheritance between them and turn in different directions. We see Jacob making his fortune among Laban's flocks, and his sons given a separate dwelling-place in the land of Goshen, because 'every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians.' We see David taken from following the flocks to be a king. With such memories to be their teacher, it was natural that the poets and prophets of Israel should turn the thought into a parable—should speak of their nation as the flock, and of God as the great Shepherd upon whose care they were dependent. 'The Lord is my shepherd. Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd. He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock.'

Our Lord took up the parable, and filled it with uttermost beauty because He filled it with Himself. When He entered upon His public work, His heart was saddened, because the multitudes were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. And now, moved perhaps by the example of bad shepherding, recorded in the previous chapter of this Gospel, He extended the thought into a complete parable.

The Church loved the thought, and dwelt upon it from the beginning. 'That great Shepherd of the sheep,' says the Epistle to the Hebrews. 'Ye are returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls,' says Peter. The popular religion of the first Christians, Dean Stanley says, 'was in one word the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace of the Good Shepherd was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one.'

Notice how the idea of the Good Shepherd throws a threefold light on the character of our Lord.

1. The thought gives us a picture of *tender care*. That is the very purpose for which a shepherd exists—to care for his flock. This care was doubly necessary in a land like Palestine, where at many points the pasture-land was upon the very borders of the great desert. The thieves and robbers and the wolf are touches of colour taken from real life.

And even as the shepherd cared for his flock, Christ cared for human souls—for the great multitude with its unreasoning movements and its unuttered wants, and for the single soul with its special needs. He cared for those who did not care for themselves. And as for those who were not cared for by the

[1] L. M. Priest.

religion and the respectability of the day, He cared for them most of all.

O Shepherd with the bleeding Feet,
Good Shepherd with the pleading Voice,
What seekest Thou from hill to hill?
Sweet were the valley pastures, sweet
The sound of flocks that bleat their joys,
And eat and drink at will.
Is one worth seeking, when Thou hast of Thine
Ninety and nine?

How should I stay my bleeding Feet,
How should I hush my pleading Voice?
I Who chose death and clomb a hill,
Accounting gall and wormwood sweet,
That hundredfold might bud My joys
For love's sake and good will.
I seek My one, for all there bide of Mine
Ninety and nine.[1]

The figure of the Good Shepherd occurs frequently in early Christian art. Usually there is a lamb upon the Good Shepherd's shoulders. But it was not always a lamb. The lamb is a symbol of innocence and purity, and the early Church seemed to think that this was not a clear enough picture of her Lord's compassion; she felt that the goats as well as the sheep must have some place in His great love.

And then she smiled; and in the Catacombs,
With eye suffused but heart inspired true,
On those walls subterranean, where she hid

Her head 'mid ignominy, death, and tombs,
She her Good Shepherd's hasty image drew—
And on his shoulders, not a lamb, a kid.[2]

It was a fine instinct that made her do so; He was the *Good* Shepherd, better than all that ever came before Him.

2. It gives us a picture of *intimate knowledge*. We may not forget this, because so the Master Himself explains His own meaning—'He calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out: and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice.' 'The flocks mixed with each other,' Sir George Adam Smith says,[3] in describing a noonday scene by a Judean well, 'and we wondered how each shepherd would get his own again. But after the watering and the playing were over, the shepherds one by one went up different sides of the valley, and each called out his peculiar call; and the sheep of each drew out of the crowd to their own shepherd, and the flocks passed away as orderly as they came.'

He meant, then, not only that He cared for the souls of men, but that He knew them. Perhaps it was because He knew them so well that He cared for them so greatly. He saw the great possibilities. You would not have it otherwise, would you? For it is not only knowledge; it is knowledge and sympathy. Napoleon is said to have had a wonderful knowledge of men. He had a quick insight into character. He knew instinctively the man who would be a good tool for him to use, and the man who was unsuited to his purpose. But he had no sympathy, and his keen glance was softened by no tenderness. Our Lord's knowledge was not only full of sympathy; it was the knowledge which only sympathy can possess.

3. It gives us a picture of *real self-sacrifice*. 'The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.' Again we must turn away our thoughts from English meadows and the fields of peaceful lands to such pastures as the Bible shepherds knew—fringing the desert and open to many a foe. Sir George Adam Smith says again, in emphasizing 'the grandeur of the shepherd's character,' 'I do not remember ever to have seen in the East a flock of sheep without a shepherd. . . . On some high moor, across which at night the hyenas howl, when you meet him, sleepless, far-sighted, weather-beaten, armed, leaning on his staff and looking out over his scattered sheep, every one of them on his heart, you understand . . . why Christ took him as the type of self-sacrifice.' So sometimes, a little at a time, by a sacrifice which lasts as long as their calling, and sometimes suddenly and in desperate conflict, good shepherds lay down their lives for their sheep.

Here also our Lord pictures Himself truly—only the reality puts the picture to shame and towers high above all types. Why did Christ die? Not under external compulsion! He is careful to make that plain. 'No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself.' He died because He cared more for others than He did for Himself; He died because His death was needful to the purpose of God, and to the redemption of the world. And now this is His strongest argument as He pleads with men to enter His fold and become members of His flock—the fact that He laid down His life for them. Show us Thy wound-prints, O Thou

[1] Christina Rossetti. [2] Matthew Arnold.
[3] *Historical Geography of the Holy Land.*

Shepherd sent from God; teach us somewhat of their meaning; and surely the self-will shall be broken within us, and we shall follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest![1]

Third Sunday after Easter.

The Response of Faith.

'Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.'—Heb 11[1].

Faith is the response of man to God, to His revelations, to His promises, and to His offers.

1. Take first His revelations, and especially *the revelation of Himself*. And here it must be pointed out that faith was not brought into the world by Christianity, and is not even peculiar to religion. Every human being is exercising faith every day of his life. All that we know about this world beyond what we perceive with our own five senses is known to us by faith. How do those of us who have never been out of Europe know that such places as Asia, Africa, and America exist? It is by faith in the testimony of those who have been there, or by inference from seeing things like black faces and white ivory, which are not produced in Europe, and which we therefore know must have come from other continents. All we know of the past of this world before we were living in it is known to us by faith, by the testimony of those who saw it and by belief on our part; and all we know of what is going on in this world at the present day beyond the range of our own senses comes to us in the same way, by testimony on the one hand and by faith on our part. Of course the testimony has to be tested: some of it is true and some of it is false, and it is the part of the wise man to sift the wheat from the chaff, and to give faith only to what is deserving of credence.

Now, among these testimonies coming from many sides calling upon us to believe in things we have never seen, there comes the testimony of God calling on us to believe in Him and His attributes. This is given us in many ways. It is given us in His works: 'The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.' It is given in His Providence, because we know that we did not bring ourselves into existence, and we know that the sweetness of life we taste is only to a very small extent produced by ourselves. It comes to us especially in conscience, where a will above our own is constantly announcing itself. Of course these evidences have also to be tested. To test them is our prerogative as thinking beings, but if they stand the test, then surely the Supreme Being ought to receive our admiration and worship and trust; and that is faith.

2. Then faith is the response of man to God's *promises*. God does not merely stand out there waiting till we recognize Him. He comes near and speaks: and His words are promises. You all remember how great a part was played in the experience of Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, by the promise of God? God had promised him land, and seed, and a blessing, and Abraham laid hold of that promise and sacrificed everything to it, abandoning everything that stood in the way, because there is always involved in faith the abandonment of what is inconsistent with its manifestation. Abraham followed the star of faith and went without turning aside, wherever it led him, and you remember that, among his successors who are distinguished for their faith, this quality of clinging to the promises is so prominent that, in that great chapter already referred to, their biographies are summed up in these remarkable words: 'These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.' The life of faith in our own day is concerned in the same way with the promises of God. These are in the Bible. The Bible is a book full of great and precious promises, and the reason why the reading of it is so essential to the Christian life is just because it is sustained by the appropriation of promises. The great promise is that of eternal life. Even among the heathen, before Christianity appeared, there was a dim expectation of immortality, and it is beautiful to see how noble spirits like Plato and Socrates followed that intimation, dim as it was, unlike some of their modern successors who, after two thousand years in the light, are still cold and negative in their thoughts about this subject. But it is in the Bible that this dim anticipation receives its confirmation, and it was Jesus Himself who spoke of the mansions that are to be our future habitation, as one well acquainted with them. And it is, above all, to the words of Christ Himself that faith clings when it lays hold of this promise.

[1] J. M. E. Ross, *The Self-Portraiture of Jesus*, 115.

3. And lastly, faith is the response of man to the *offers* of God. This third word is used in order to emphasize a little more strongly the personal element in God's dealing with us. He comes nearer to us than He comes even in the promises. Person to person He makes us offers. Now His great offer is His Son, whom He offers to be the Saviour of the world. This is a world of sin and misery, and the world has for thousands of years been looking for some one to heal its diseases. There have not been wanting practitioners and deliverers and reformers, but the poor human race is like an invalid who has been long under the power of a malady, and has spent all her living on physicians, and is nothing better, but rather worse. Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? God's answer to that appeal of humanity is the offer of His Son. Why should I receive such an offer? The Son of God, I am told, has died for me. What need have I for an atonement to be made for my soul? What danger was I in that the Son of God had to come from heaven and to be incarnate, in order to save me? Along a line like that any man might come to realize the importance of Christ to him. And He is not dead, He is alive. He comes to me and asks if I will have Him for my Saviour, and when in timidity and humility, but in gratitude, my being rises up and accepts Him as He offers Himself to me, that is faith.[1]

Only by God coming down—
Only by Life divine,
Bearing the curse of mine,
Cometh my crown.

Only unspeakable love—
Only the love divine,
Finding response in mine,
Lifteth above.[2]

Fourth Sunday after Easter.

The True Business of the Christian.

'And a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.'—Is 32^2.

1. *The words are a description of Christ.* It is not necessary for us to hold in any hard and dogmatic way that Isaiah, when he forecast this scene of human happiness and strength, saw precisely how it was going to be fulfilled. What concerns us to believe is that the Eternal Spirit, speaking through him, did describe a state of human society much nearer to the heart of God than anything which at that time existed in the world. It is a state of society much nearer to the heart of God than anything which exists now. In the prophet's view it is a condition of things which shall take form whenever true thoughts of God and of life control men's minds. And there Isaiah prepares us for the message of Jesus.

We Christians, when we read or when we hear these words, apply them immediately to our Lord: and this more and more. For as time goes on and the plot of life thickens about us, we more and more passionately, and even desperately, cling to Christ, because He alone meets our yearnings and necessities as men. Of course we will never know what Christ can be until we allow Him to have to do with our true and personal life. And many of us are not ready to admit Christ into our true life until we are in some stark necessity. We have gone to Christ only in our day of darkness. Even so, we have gone to Him, and we have found in Him—even in the bare fact that He was there and that He had said what He had said—we have found what humble and suppliant souls have ever found in Him. And to describe this experience no words are more natural and fitting than the strong words of the psalm which speaks about taking us from a 'fearful pit and from the miry clay,' or such words as Isaiah uses here, about an hiding-place, and a covert, and fresh-flowing water, and a shade from the glare of an intolerable sun upon an endless waste of sand.

2. *The words are a description of the Christian.* The charge is made against us who are called Christians, that we are apt to be indifferent to the social conditions in which we live. Where we are acutely religious we are preoccupied—so it is alleged—with our own soul, with its ups and downs of feeling, and away in the background, with an intermittent anxiety as to our destiny after death. When we have ceased to be acutely religious we have become really indifferent to everything except our own material interests, which we may go so far as to admit are secured to a certain extent by the prevalence round about us of those decencies and quiet habits which religion on the whole safeguards. And so we, without intending anything

[1] J. Stalker.
[2] E. H. Divall, *A Believer's Rest*, 169.

so crude, may fall into a way of patronizing religion, on the ground that though we ourselves may not need its maxims or its threatenings or its promises, nevertheless it is good for masses of people who without it might become troublesome and dangerous. But whether we are acutely religious, or whether in our case religion, having lost for us its edge and direct necessity, has now become a merely decent custom for which we can see reason enough to be at some small pains lest it die and worse things befall us—in either case, so it is alleged of us to-day, sometimes sadly, sometimes with bitterness and contempt, we think of religion, of Christianity, as a plan or scheme by which our own individual interests, whether those be conceived as a deep thing or a shallow thing, are secured both in this world and in any world which may follow upon this one.

We must admit the enormous amount of truth there is in this charge. It is true there have been times when people who claimed to be Christian felt no responsibility for the world in which they lived. But it is difficult to be quite fair to those who live in any age but our own. Whilst a really good man in any age will resemble in certain matters a really good man in any other age, there will always be differences. On certain matters it will always be more tolerable for one age than for another in the day of judgment. There were good and serious men in the eighteenth century, or even early in the nineteenth, who looked round upon their fellow-men living in much poverty and distress, and, except for the responsibility which they would probably acknowledge of dispensing a little charity amongst them, not feeling that they were called upon to work up any further agony of sympathy. Because for one thing most men were poor. In the year 1801, the total currency in Scotland from John O'Groat's to Maidenkirk was 200,000 Scots pounds, each worth about five shillings in pre-war currency, that is, about one-and-eightpence nowadays. That was all the money that Scotland possessed, so that there were few people far removed from the grindstone.

And besides, whether it was a better state of things or a worse, the fact is that religion at that time was conceived by rich and poor, gentle and simple, as a matter between the individual soul and God. Anything which followed from a sound relationship between God and one's soul was, of course, an admirable thing—any kindness or charity. But such things were not of the essence of Christianity as then conceived.

It may seem to us strange that good people could ever imagine that they could be pleasing to God if they lived selfishly—no matter how fine that selfishness might be. Certainly we know better. Things do move. The true, and, when all is said, the only business of Christianity is that by the help of God working through its laws and promises and presences, souls may one by one be saved. But it may be that God has given to our time a truer, deeper understanding of what it means to have one's soul saved. Saved from the assaults of animal passion, from some numbing memory, from some maddening remorse? Yes. But saved from much besides all these. What is the spirit of self-seeking but the dominion over our soul of the animal propensity, from which a man is saved only when his heart is generous and kind. In fact, we are beginning to see that the phrase 'to be saved,' as expressing the business and fruit of the Christian faith and obedience, is a partial and incomplete expression. What we are always forgetting is that God's purpose is not to save us, but to save the world. It is because we form a part of the world that we come within His love. Whatever He has done for us, He did for the sake of the world through us. Whatever He has given us, He gave as a loan, that we might let it out to the world.

Looking back over the last thirty years, and pondering the revelation of Himself and of life's meaning which God has been giving us all through the history and the literature of that time, one thing above all others seems to have been His intention—and that to teach us how we need one another, and how we depend upon one another.

The question for us, first one by one, and then in groups, communities, countries to be agreed upon, is as to whether the ideal in Isaiah's version touches our imagination—persuades us of its glory. A world in which men do not strive with one another, conceiving of success as something to be gained by another's defeat, taking pride in another's overthrow! A world in which one nation shall be as concerned for another's welfare as though it were her own—as indeed in the long run it is her own! A world in which a man shall be to another man as an hiding-place from the wind, as a covert from the storm; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a rock in a weary land!

A world in which anything conflicting with such an ideal shall be tolerated only under a sad sense of necessity and always only as a temporary thing, to be removed at the earliest possible moment and hurled into the limbo of shameful and discredited things! To believe in such a world, and to plan its coming—what is that but to be a Christian?[1]

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

A Bond-servant.

'Simon Peter, a servant.'—2 P 1[1].

The word is 'slave,' though even the Revisers have not dared to translate it so, the nearest they approach to it being 'bond-servant' in their margin.

St. Paul calls himself in five of his Epistles 'the slave of Jesus Christ' or 'of God.' And other writers do the same; we find it in the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude. They all gloried in it—the glory of humility and the glory of being human. To St. Paul it was a peculiar dignity that he was able to say, 'I bear about in my body the brands—the slave-marks—of the Lord Jesus.' The humility is glorious just because a human being can render it voluntarily. He is an active, and not a passive, tool of God. The Old Testament writer who soared to the highest point of inspired genius was the prophet who pictured the ideal Israel as the 'Servant—the slave—of Jehovah.' And the New Testament seer, rapt in the mystic vision of the heavenly Jerusalem, delights in speaking of the Christian Church, the New Israel, as God's slaves. 'Hurt not the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the slaves of our God in their foreheads.' 'Praise our God, all ye his slaves.' 'His slaves shall serve him, and they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads.' And our thoughts can travel from all these saints of God to the greatest of them: 'He hath regarded the lowliness of his slave.' 'Behold, the slave of the Lord: be it unto me according to thy word.' And once more, our thoughts can take wing, and soar up from the mother to her Child: 'He emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being made in the likeness of men.' Are we not right in saying that a slave is 'a vessel unto honour'?

'Peter, a slave.' Let us see what is implied in this suggestive word.

1. First, the term 'slave' implies the *acknowledgment of a fact.* He has been bought. He is the Lord's property. A great price has been paid for him. The apostle thought of his Master's weary days and nights, of the tears and agonies of Gethsemane, of the shame and darkness and abandonment of Calvary. By all this expenditure on the part of the Saviour the apostle had been bought. He acknowledged his Master's rights; he was his Master's slave.

2. Secondly, the term 'slave' implies *the assumption of an attitude.* The apostle puts himself in the posture of homage and obedience. His eye was ever watching the Master, his ear was ever listening. He was a slave, but not servile. If we would learn what 'slave' means in the text, we must go to the love-sphere and seek the interpretation there. We must go where the lover slaves for the loved, and yet calls her slavery exquisite freedom. A real loving mother, slaving for her child, would not change her slavery for mines of priceless wealth or for unbroken years of cushioned ease. 'Thy willing slave, I.'

3. And thirdly, to be a slave implies *the discharge of a mission.* 'Peter, a slave and apostle.' He is sent forth to do the Master's will. The Master bids; he goes. Anywhere! Through the long dusty, tiring highways of righteousness, or to the valley of gloom; 'through the thirsty desert or the dewy mead.'

> His not to reason why,
> His not to make reply,
> His but to do and die!

But in that bondage the apostle finds a perfect freedom. All the powers of his being are emancipated and sing together in glorious liberty. Life that is fundamentally bound becomes like an orchestra, every faculty constituting a well-tuned instrument, and all of them co-operating in the production of a harmony which is well-pleasing in the ears of God.[1]

[1] J. A. Hutton, *The Victory over Victory*, 71.

Ascension Day.

The Ascension of Christ.

'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive: thou hast received gifts among men, yea, among the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell with them.'—Ps 68[18] (R.V.).

The translation of this verse in the Authorized Version has been influenced by the use made of

[1] J. H. Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Peter*, 208.

the passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians 4^8, where it is definitely applied to the Ascension of Christ; for the translators of the Authorized Version were not above concealing difficulties, and they were very much under the dominion of theories of prophetic fulfilment. The mysterious premonition of the Ascension is somewhat dissipated by a more accurate translation of the Hebrew. If we follow the suggestion the critics make as to the original reference of this Psalm, we must understand it as a description of how the ark of Jehovah was brought over the mountains of Judea in triumphal procession and was at length lodged in the Temple on Mount Zion, the procession including prisoners taken captive from subjugated nations and bearing gifts from the powers which had rebelled against Israel. Now it is perfectly possible that this was the original circumstance which inspired the poet, but he has only taken this as a starting-point for singing of something far more wonderful. As a description of any actual transference of the ark of God to the sanctuary on Zion it is far-fetched and misleading. But he has seen in that event a symbol of the final exaltation of Jehovah over rival gods because His true sanctuary is in heaven, the seat of all power.

St. Paul's application of this verse to the Ascension of Christ only carries the suggestion embedded in the Psalm a stage further; he has altered received gifts 'from' men to receive gifts 'for' men. But he was probably not the first to make that alteration; it had already been made by the Talmudic commentators who thought this was more seemly as applied to God, who does not need to take anything from men's hands; so that it was now entirely suitable for a description of the Ascension, which was the prelude to the pouring forth of the gift of the Holy Spirit upon mankind. And it is no unwarrantable application of the verse. There is nothing which really does justice to the language of the Psalmist save the Ascension; he had spiritualized an ecclesiastical procession as a symbol of Jehovah's exaltation to the throne of heaven; here was its actual fulfilment. We are compelled to admit that a spiritual imagination was at work in this author, which was premonitory of that great triumph of Christ which is called the Ascension.

1. *The nature of the Ascension.*—It is both a physical event and a moral exaltation. What the whole series of events in which the life of Christ is set is meant to reveal is that fundamentally and finally the moral and the physical are not unrelated or opposed realms; but that the attainment of supreme moral excellence brings perfect control over the physical universe. Christ's Resurrection was a fact which had manifestation in the physical realm; but the power which brought about the Resurrection was spiritual—the effect of transcendent holiness. In the same way the Ascension was not simply an elevation to some point in the skies over our heads, but the elevation of Christ to spiritual supremacy. On the other hand, it was not simply an invisible moral elevation; it was also an elevation into the realm of ultimate power, which means power not only over spiritual things but over the material universe as well; therefore it had a corresponding physical manifestation. There is nothing we need to have more firmly fixed in our faith than the belief that spiritual forces can change the nature of the physical universe.

2. *The meaning of the Ascension.*—At no time has it been more necessary to try to recover the religious reality which the Ascension reveals. Almost all that was hoped from the War has failed to come. The great menace to peace has not been removed. We still have coercion, force as the cure for force; and the only protection against violence is in being violent yourself first. The vicious circles are found everywhere. What can be done? We must hold with joyous faith that the peasant Carpenter, by virtue of His triumph over the powers of this world, is at the Father's right hand in the one place of power; that among the spiritual realities He is enthroned as supreme, and by the spirits who understand He is recognized as the only Hope and Saviour of the world.

We must commend the faith in these realities to all sorts and conditions of men. We must seek to impress upon the rulers of this world the fatal policy they are pursuing in trusting to repression, coercion, and force, and urge upon them a new policy of trust in man's response to the methods of Christ; persuade them of the reasonableness of seeking a way of reconciliation, try to win them from their fearful statecraft to one of greater generosity. What we must try to get out of men's minds is the idea that the whole business of government is a thing that stands right outside the religious realm, and that here Christian principles are inapplicable. What the Ascension means is

that Christ is elevated to the position of supreme authority because of what He is and because of what He has done; because His way of friendship and hope and love is the only way that will work. Surely it needs little arguing at this time of day that whether Christ's way would work or not, no other way works, and whatever risk it entails, it entails no such certainty of failure as the way of war, threats, violence, and intimidation.

But to recommend any such method to men we must have a definite religious faith, a definiteness of which the belief in the Ascension of Christ is the test; the belief that God has highly exalted Him, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and dominion. Only if we believe this can we dare to put in operation the entire reversal of worldly policy that it recommends. What there is for us to do, who strive to hold both the doctrinal reality and the practical applicability of our faith, is to believe that since our Lord has been exalted to the place of power, the very evolution of history must in time reveal to all men that Christ is the only King, His way of life the only solution, and His authority the only authority that shall never be shaken, His power the only power we can dare to trust.[1]

[1] W. E. Orchard, *The Safest Mind Cure*, 145.

Herrmann of Marburg.

By the Reverend J. G. Tasker, D.D., Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham.

In 1879 Wilhelm Herrmann, Privatdozent in Halle, was appointed Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Marburg. In 1886, at the age of forty, he published the book which has had a widespread and abiding influence on theologians of various schools: *The Communion of the Christian with God*, translated into English in 1895[1] from the second German edition. Herrmann remained at Marburg, notwithstanding three invitations to other Universities, and resigned his professorship soon after his seventieth birthday. In the narrower sense of the word, he did not found a school, but upon the students from many lands who heard him lecture at Marburg he made a deep and lasting impression. Since his death in 1922, generous tributes have been paid to him as 'the most distinguished of the Ritschlians,' especially emphasizing his scrupulous regard for truth, and his 'unconditional respect for reality.' These were the chief characteristics of his theology as of his piety, for in his devout personality theology and religion were not only united but also unified. Amongst those who agree in this witness are Schäder, whose *Theocentric Theology* was written as a corrective to Herrmann's teaching, and the late Professor Troeltsch, who differed from his *Ethics* published in 1901.

[1] On the title-page of this edition, Herrmann's Christian name is wrongly given as 'Willibald.'

In a recently published pamphlet,[2] Lic. F. W. Schmidt, Privatdozent at the University of Halle-Wittenberg, announces the publication in the near future of a complete edition of Herrmann's works, to which he will contribute an Introduction containing, *inter alia*, an appreciation of the Marburg theologian's literary life-work. Meanwhile Schmidt has given some interesting details of the professor at whose feet he sat, and to whose teaching he confesses that he is greatly indebted. At the same time he points out what he has come to regard as defects in Herrmann's theology, and indicates directions in which his disciples are strengthening and supplementing his system of Christian doctrine.

Herrmann was a son of the manse, and in later years expressed his gratitude for the atmosphere of Lutheran piety which pervaded his home. As a student in Halle (1864–1870) his principal teachers were representatives of the 'mediating' school, namely, Julius Müller and Tholuck, in whose house Herrmann lived for two and a half years. 'It was owing to their piety rather than to their theology that the tie which bound him to these theologians proved to be permanent.' After the war with France in 1870, in which he served as a soldier, he made

[2] *Wilhelm Herrmann:* Ein Bekenntniss zu seiner Theologie. Von Lic. Friedrich Wilhelm Schmidt. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr. 1922.

a thorough study of the philosophy of Kant, and gained in consequence two academic prizes. His thesis on *Gregorii Nysseni sententiæ de salute adipiscenda* (1874) was highly commended by Ritschl; he became Privatdozent in Halle, and at the same time gave religious instruction to the upper classes in the Gymnasium. During this period Ritschl's influence steadily gained upon him; the basis of his teaching was Ritschl's *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion*. In Tholuck's house he had been introduced to Ritschl, but it was the reading of the Göttingen professor's writings and not attendance at his lectures that proved the decisive factor in Herrmann's theological development. His book, *Die Metaphysik in der Theologie* (1876), began the long series of publications issued by theologians of the school of Ritschl; but it is noteworthy that his appointment to the Chair of Dogmatic Theology at Marburg followed the publication in 1879 of his book entitled *Religion in relation to Knowledge and Morality*, in which, on the theory of knowledge, he took up a position independent of his master and proved that he had critical acumen of a high order.

In *The Communion of the Christian with God* (Eng. trans. 1895, p. 69) there is a striking passage in which Herrmann places the work of the preacher of the gospel above that of the academic theologian. He coveted the gifts of the preacher, whose privilege it is 'to give to the community the best thing that can be given it.' But of himself he modestly said: 'The writer's power is insufficient for such speech concerning Jesus as should make His portrait alive and powerful in the soul of the reader.' Schmidt maintains that, in this respect, Herrmann greatly underrated his own ability. 'He had the power which a prophetic personality possesses of stating his leading ideas forcefully and from ever-changing points of view.' Above all, it was his personal faith and living experience that made an irresistible impression upon his hearers and readers. At times, too, in criticizing his opponents his utterances did not lack the irony and the severity of the prophet.

As a lecturer, Herrmann is described as avoiding rhetoric and literary adornment; he always kept himself in the background. It seemed to his students as though he intentionally refused to make propaganda for his teaching by personal intercourse. He preferred to leave his theology to make its own impression. Yet to those who attended his lectures they were a revelation of his own heart and of his religious belief; hence they attracted students who hitherto had been accustomed to turn away from religion and theology with a shrug of the shoulders. 'I remember to this day with what reverence medical and other students spoke of the lecture on "The Reality of God" which the venerable professor, sitting at his ease and completely absorbed in his theme, delivered without a note.'

The greater part of Schmidt's work is devoted to a critical examination of Herrmann's teaching. In two chapters, entitled respectively, 'Religion in relation to Knowledge and Morality' and 'The Basis of the Christian Faith,' he briefly refers to the chief writings which have dealt with the questions raised by Herrmann, recognizing fully the need for correlating, either by extension or modification, his theology with the important results arrived at by scholars who have been engaged in the historical and comparative study of religion. Herrmann's disciples value most highly the deposit of truth which he has bequeathed to them, but in very loyalty to his memory they hold it to be their bounden duty to adapt as well as to apply his teaching to the changed aspects in which the problems he endeavoured to solve present themselves to the modern mind. It is the abiding distinction of Herrmann that he constructed 'a synthesis between Albrecht Ritschl and Schleiermacher'; he combined into a higher unity the essential truths of their respective systems, his aim always being to conserve and to utilize the treasure which systematic theology has inherited from Luther.

The Withered Fig-tree.

By the Reverend S. Tonkin, B.D., Ilkley.

A personal confession may perhaps be permitted. Some months ago, in one of our darker hours, I was anxious to preach a sermon from the text 'Have faith in God' (Mk 11^{22}). But I found that this verse and the verse which follows are inextricably bound up with the incident of the fig-tree. Whether I wished it or not, I was compelled either to grapple with that incident or to abandon my first hope of using those verses in an honest and useful way. The latest reference in The Expository Times to the incident is, I believe, on p. 74, vol. xxxii.—'The only reasonable explanation seems to be that . . . in order to enforce a vital lesson, Jesus sacrificed the tree.' But to hold such a view comes near to 'reducing Jesus to the level of an expert preacher always on the alert for subjects or texts';[1] moreover, it greatly adds to the difficulty of understanding what His vital lesson was. Yet those who do not hold this view seem a little cautious in stating their opinion as to what took place.[2] I am anxious, therefore, that my own view should be permitted expression; for I believe that, until we have found our way to the heart of this incident, we are in danger of neglecting or misusing one of the most precious passages in the whole of the New Testament.

I begin with the assumption that Mark's account is preferable to Matthew's.[3] I would then suggest that—

(*a*) The tree died a natural death, the disciples having no thought of a curse till they saw it, withered, on the second morning.

(*b*) Mark wrongly assumed the tree to be cursed, seeing that Peter, his informant, had jumped to that conclusion. (It is natural that in accordance with that assumption Mark should introduce after his account of the incident the two verses $11^{24f.}$ spoken on some other occasion.)[4]

(*c*) With the exception of these two verses, Mark's account of what was said and done seems entirely natural and self-consistent.

If, now, I can offer an exceedingly simple hypothesis regarding the fate of the tree, and can show that my hypothesis is in harmony with all the recorded facts, including the words of Jesus and Peter, then the very simplicity of that hypothesis may be regarded as an argument in its favour.

I.

Some time ago a philosopher and botanist well known to readers of this journal, taking me through his fine garden, pointed out that while every oak had its roots generously covered, other large trees had theirs bared to a depth, perhaps, of three feet. These naked ropes twined about some large rocks, as though the rocks had afforded anchorage when the storms had washed the soil away. But I was told it was a question not of storms but of birds. The oak has a seed too large to be swallowed with comfort by, say, a chaffinch or a tit. But the smaller seeds, such as those of the sycamore, were sown by the birds *on the top of the rock*. In a rainy season such seeds have both the nutriment and moisture enabling them to send filaments across the rock, and down the side, to mother earth; after that, real growth can begin.[5] But if the rock is not an isolated one—if it is a protuberance on a rocky shelf running a few inches under the level of the soil—the struggling tree will have a history similar to that of this fig-tree.

Fig-trees produce a small seed! We read in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels that

[1] P. T. Forsyth says of the teaching of Jesus on another occasion: 'The words of Christ . . . are all indirect autobiography.' 'He was so deeply moved that He could not be silent' (see *The Principle of Authority*, p. 25, from which my phrase is borrowed).

[2] Cf. a most suggestive writer in *The Expositor* (Nov. 1920, p. 365): 'The narrative reflects at least an impression left upon the disciple-circle. Jesus remained in their memories of that time as the wielder of fierce and terrible powers.'

[3] 'In those narratives which Peter was in a position to communicate as hardly any one else was, we recognize a very primitive tradition, and are on firm historical ground' (Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 77).

[4] Is this too simple a solution of the difficulty felt regarding the position of these verses? (*D.C.G.* i. p. 593*b*).

[5] I have since been surprised to notice what a number of great trees originated, apparently, in this hazardous way. Near my home are large ones perched on boulders six feet high or more. They look like the victims of a landslide. But I have not yet seen an oak in such a position.

they grow 'in many places *spontaneously*.' And that means that birds will sow them wherever rocky protuberances (no less than the branches of other trees) invite them to. In a climate hot as that of Palestine such rocky places would serve, first, as a potent forcing-bed, later, as a pitiless death-trap. Jesus, as a boy,[1] must have been familiar with such forced and fruitless growths. Our Lord cannot have been surprised that the tree in question bore no fruit, since 'it was not the season of figs.' He was attracted by the premature foliage. He half expected to see those leaves—as indeed they were—already slightly wilting in the sun. The disciples may fail to see the facts of the case, but to this lover of 'bird and beast and the wild, open country-side,'[1] it is obvious that the scorched and shallow-rooted tree is under sentence of death; a few more hours under a fierce sun must complete its destruction.

II.

'Tout ce que nous apercevons est symbolique.'[2] For our Lord, the tree symbolized Jerusalem, the one burden on His heart at the moment. That is possibly why He noticed it from afar, though the disciples assumed a different reason. All scenes of failure carried the thoughts of Jesus to Jerusalem at this time—even so small a scene as a brood of chickens running from the anxious hen. Baudouin reminds us that such associations are more apt to form 'dans un état affectif fort que dans un état affectif faible.'[3] Remembering the intense emotional strain under which Jesus was now living (it was the morning of the day on which He cleansed the temple), I would venture to say it was inevitable that the fated tree should take His thoughts to the fated city.[4] 'No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever' (O Jerusalem!). For her life was not rooted in the depths.[5] She had for long concealed her emotional shallowness and religious poverty under her ritualistic display. But her power to satisfy men's hearts was gone; death itself follows hard upon her.

We are not told the effect of their Master's words upon the disciples; we read merely that they 'heard it.' They noticed, probably, a certain vehemence in His manner, but were unable to account for it. There is no reference (in Mark) to any immediate change in the tree. But the next morning, when it is obviously withered, Peter jumps to his conclusion and speaks of 'the fig-tree which thou cursedst.' The reply is difficult only if we fail to see it is in the nature of great soliloquy.[6] Jesus replies to the situation Peter's words suggest. The fate of the tree affects Him as a confirmation of His fears for His city. He sees her as already destroyed. But then Love rebels against such a doom. *Speaking to His own need rather than to His companions,* He rallies His own faith. 'Have faith in God.' Whatever the sin of the city or the folly of the scribes, have faith in God. To faith, no situation is hopeless, no mission too hazardous, no cross too grievous. 'Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have it.' We have here no teacher lecturing his pupils. We hear the

with the gathering of wild flowers in childhood; with Saturday afternoon excursions in schoolboy days. . . .' (Herbert Spencer, quoted by Ribot in *The Psychology of the Emotions*, p. 177).

Luke omits the incident, not because he records the parable, but because he 'ever spares the Twelve' (see A. B. Bruce, *With Open Face*).

[1] T. R. Glover, in *The Jesus of History*, p. 31, comparing Jesus with Jeremiah, speaks of 'another country-bred boy with the same love for bird and beast and the wild, open country-side.'

[2] Quoted by Baudouin in *Études de Psychanalyse*, p. 25.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 31.

[4] It is sometimes suggested that this whole incident of the withered fig-tree is but a dramatized form of the parable. But if Jesus, in a parable, has likened Jerusalem to a fig-tree, *it becomes all the more likely that, whenever He sees a fig-tree,* He will think of Jerusalem. 'The cawing of rooks is not in itself an agreeable sound . . . yet (it) usually produces pleasurable feelings . . . because it has been connected with countless of (our) greatest gratifications—

[5] Forsyth's remarks (in *The Principle of Authority*, p. 40 f.) might be reminiscent of this incident: 'In religion . . . we do not stand on something solid like a rock, but we grow in something vital like a soil.' . . . 'It is better, of course, to be on rock than sand, but to be in soil is better still.'

[6] I find the suggestions of both Swete and Menzies here a little strained. There are other examples of soliloquy, on the part of Jesus, which used to be taken as 'teaching.' I turn again to Forsyth, whose comments on the words of Jesus so often take his readers to the heart of things. 'He stood still and silent. The passion had begun. He was conquering His distress by prayer. He always did. Beware of soliloquy (you poor Hamlets, of an unhinged age!) if it do not turn to prayer' ('The Fatherhood of Death,' in *Missions in State and Church*, p. 8).

lover declare his faith in the future of his beloved despite the blackest evidence. We are privileged to watch the Son of God bow His head in acceptance of the Cross. 'The passion had begun.'

III.

There can be, I think, only one difficulty in the way of such an interpretation as that suggested above—and that is the attitude of the Twelve. It is incredible (it may be said) that these men were all blind to the condition of the tree; and that, in addition, they so misunderstood what Jesus said. And yet a few simple considerations may serve to remind us that it is not incredible. It is not even unnatural. It is precisely what fair-minded men and women might expect.

Lafcadio Hearn once told his students that if a number of them were to write down their impressions of a certain tree the majority of them would write very nearly the same thing. But 'suppose there is one among you of a remarkably powerful talent of the poetical and artistic kind. His description of the tree would be startlingly different from that of the rest of you. It would surprise you all, so that you would have to look at the tree again in order to see whether the description was true. Then you would be still more surprised to find that it was much more true than any other; and then you would not only discover that he had enabled you to understand the tree in a new way, but also that the rest of you had hardly seen it, and your description was all wrong.' [1] The disciples 'had hardly seen' the tree. 'Man always wants his curiosity gratified for a particular purpose.' The particular purpose of these men would seem to have been the satisfaction of hunger. They did not fail, therefore, to notice there were leaves. But they did not get so far as observing the condition of the leaves. They assumed, as I fear Dr Swete assumed, that a tree in advance of the others must be healthy. We see what we expect to see! [2]

But still other factors should be noticed. The Twelve, like their Master, had been living under considerable strain. On the road going up to Jerusalem 'they were amazed.' It is possible that some of them were among those described as 'afraid' (Mk 10^{32}). Subsequent events would have increased rather than lessened their amazement and vague apprehension. 'It is a familiar fact that correct observation and reasoning are hampered by emotion'; and 'It is vague emotion, or such as finds no appropriate expression in action, that favours suggestibility.' [3] This little group of strained, bewildered men were capable of jumping to any conclusion, and upon any chance suggestion. Their own need very naturally led to their assumption that their Master's interest in the tree was that of hunger; and the chance suggestion that led eventually to the idea of a curse may have been that vehemence in His manner referred to above.

So Jesus makes no attempt to correct the false impression His followers have formed; the circumstances that led to the mistake make it almost impossible to remove it. What infinite pains are needed with men in their condition! [4] Is it irreverent to suggest that Jesus Himself was too near physical exhaustion to attempt this so difficult task with good hope of success? We have another example of their very unfortunate misunderstanding of Him, and in similar circumstances. In that case, too, He seemed to abandon all hope of making the matter clear. 'He said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet: and he that hath none, let him sell his cloke, and buy a sword. . . . And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. *And He said unto them, It is enough.*'

IV.

I have been at pains to bring together these

[1] *Life and Literature*, p. 49 ff. These pages afford a delightful commentary on receiving the Kingdom of God as a little child. The child sees the tree much as the artist or the poet sees it.

[2] 'The Problem of the Galloping Horse,' in *More Science from an Easy Chair*, by Sir Ray Lankester, is a fine example of this. And among the book reviews in *The Nation* for March 19, 1921, we are told that some 'eminent' persons during the war told the time by 'an undisguised and quite obvious barometer.'

Allowance should, perhaps, also be made for the working of the Group Mind. 'We do not set ten men to keep the look-out on ship-board, but only one; though the safety of the ship and of all that it carries depends upon his unremitting alertness' (McDougall, *The Group Mind*, p. 43).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 42.

[4] 'It is one of the tritest of truisms that human intelligences of a simple order are very literal . . . dry, prosaic, and matter-of-fact in their remarks. But turn to the highest order of minds, and what a change! . . . the unexpected seems the only law' (W. James, in *Great Men and their Environment*).

considerations, not that I might complicate a simple matter, but because I wished to show that the simpler interpretation of what Jesus said has a great deal to support it. If Jesus was rallying His own faith, the narrative is robbed of its difficulties; moreover, it gains a new devotional value for us. It becomes a window affording us a glimpse into the experience of our Lord; and it appeals to our own faith, while no longer perplexing it. For it sets before us the faith of our Lord actually engaged in the removal of mountains, not in the easy way of miracle, but by long labour, and blood, and godly patience.

Faith is infectious; so that if one man's faith demand the removal of a mountain he gathers about him, at last, ten thousand others, like-minded with himself; and between them they may actually remove the mountain by the cart-load.[1]

Even more striking is the inventiveness of faith. It discovers ways of ensuring that the things which ought to be shall become the things that are. Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's volume on *Lord Grey of the Reform Bill* is a fine setting forth of the inventiveness of faith. 'The members whose seats were marked for the sacrifice lay back and laughed in bitter contempt as "a little fellow not weighing above eight stone" swept away, one by one, the venerable legacies of five hundred years.'[2]

But greater than all other illustrations of the activities of faith is the supreme example of our Lord. It was His faith that brought Him into our world, and made Him so patient with His undiscerning followers, and took Him at last to the Cross. We cannot believe that in the very shadow of the Cross He blasted a tree and declared that faith could do other deeds similar to that. But we can, and should, believe that He gained strength from the contemplation of the Father's nearness and holy love; and that, at last, His followers, in the history of Jerusalem and of the Church, and in their own experience, began to see the meaning of the words that had bewildered them; and that Peter, thinking of such things as these, writes to his friends in time of stress—'that the proof of your faith, being more precious than gold that perisheth though it is proved by fire, might be found unto praise and glory and honour at the revelation of Jesus Christ'; and 'who is he that will harm you, if ye be zealous of that which is good?'

[1] As in the case of the diamond mines in South Africa. In the place of Colesberg Kopje now stands a huge crater from the edge of which men working at the bottom look like ants (see *Cecil Rhodes*, by Basil Williams).

[2] P. 281.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Latest Phase of Hexateuch Criticism.[1]

During the last three or four decades of last century the discussion of the Hexateuch turned in the main upon literary criticism, which was prosecuted with extraordinary acumen by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Dillmann, and others; and it is difficult to believe that the broad results achieved by those distinguished critics will ever be seriously shaken. But the amazing discoveries of the literary treasures of Babylon and Egypt gave a new turn to the discussion, and criticism began to consider as its task the interpretation of the relations subsisting between Hebrew literature and religion and those two great literatures and religions—incidentally also other literatures and religions of the ancient East. The era of purely literary criticism and documentary analysis was believed to be as good as closed.

Professor Eissfeldt denies that this is so. In his skilful and fascinating discussion of Hexateuchal analysis he takes up the task which was supposed to be completed about twenty years ago, and attacks the problem afresh with a thorough knowledge of the work of his predecessors and a most refreshing independence of judgment. Dismissing at the outset Deuteronomy and the purely legal

[1] *Hexateuch-Synopse*: Die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuchs, in ihre vier Quellen zerlegt und in deutscher Uebersetzung dargeboten samt einer in Einleitung und Anmerkungen gegebenen Begründung, von Otto Eissfeldt (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, pp. 108, 285; 11s.).

portions of P, he maintains that there are in the narrative of the Hexateuch not, as has hitherto been believed, three great documentary sources, J, E, and P, but four—L, J, E, P. The symbol L is used to describe what he calls the *Lay* source, the most primitive and the most secular source of all—the antipodes, whether as regards its literary or its religious spirit and outlook, of the sacerdotal P.

Some elements of this truth had, of course, been already recognized by previous investigators. Every one was ready to admit the existence of secondary and sometimes even of tertiary strata in the great documents. This fact was represented by the signs J^1, J^2, E^1, E^2, P^1, P^2. The existence of later additions to the main strand of P, and of the presence of fragments older than the main strand of J, was a concession which could not be denied to the facts: it is easier to ridicule what our obscurantist friends foolishly call these 'algebraic symbols' than to deny the literary phenomena which they are an attempt to explain. In particular, it has long been felt that there are two J accounts of the Flood: the notice in Gn 4^{20-22}, which traces the nomad, the musician, and the smith back to antediluvian ancestors, can hardly be from the same hand as that which describes the Flood as putting an end to every family of the human race but one.

Earlier discussion, as Dr. Eissfeldt points out, had been vitiated, perhaps inevitably, by one or two misconceptions. It had laid too confident stress on the varying names of Deity as indications of the literary source, it had not been sufficiently sceptical in its attitude to the Massoretic text, and —so far as style and vocabulary are concerned—its criticism had been too much dominated by the experience it had won on the field of Genesis, which had received the earliest and keenest attention: with the result that it had tended to overlook the inevitable differences of vocabulary between such a book as Joshua with its story of the conquest, and such a book as Genesis with its background of semi-nomadic life.

There had always been refractory fragments, which could not be readily fitted into any of the great documentary sources, and critics were content to regard these as, in a sense, erratic blocks. Perhaps the most striking of these fragments are the marriage of the sons of God and the daughters of men, whose offspring were the giants (Gn 6^{1-4}), and the extraordinary story in Ex 4^{24-26} of the angry Jahweh who sought to kill Moses, but who was appeased by the circumcision of his son. It is the supreme merit of Dr. Eissfeldt that he has discovered, by his meticulous analysis of the whole Hexateuchal text, a document which, quite as much as J, E, and P, runs through the whole historical narrative at least up to Jg 2^9—a document in which these and other hitherto isolated fragments are found quite naturally to lie. This document is traced with immense care and thoroughness, and with an acuteness worthy of Wellhausen himself, through the whole story, in a discussion which covers eighty-eight crowded pages. One narrative after another is shown to contain indubitable traces of three sources, where hitherto only two, J and E, had been suspected. Or it would be more true to say that the facts had often compelled previous critics to admit, especially in the books of Exodus and Joshua, that the analysis into J and E left some unexplained residua, but the awkward clauses or phrases were conveniently disposed of sometimes as glosses, sometimes in other ways. If, as seems probable, Dr. Eissfeldt's contention is justified, these subterfuges, which were never very satisfactory, are no longer necessary; and in addition we have a real enrichment of our knowledge alike of the history of Hebrew tradition and Hebrew religion.

Triplicate narratives had, of course, been noticed before—the most obvious perhaps being the story of a patriarch's denial of his wife in Gn 12, 20, and 26, of which 20 without doubt belongs to E, and—on this new theory—12 and 26 would be assigned to L and J. On the general principle that the story which implies the narrower horizon is more likely to be primitive than one which has wider topographical relations, Dr. Eissfeldt assigns ch. 26, which connects the patriarch with Gerar, to L, and ch. 12, which connects him with Egypt, to J. In Gn 31^{17-43}, he points out, there are three versions of Jacob's flight from Laban, which accounts for the three different cases of word-play on the word *ganab*, steal; in L, Rachel steals the teraphim (v.^{19}); in J, Jacob is accused by Laban of stealing the household stuff (vv.$^{27.\,37}$); and in E, which often puts a finer point upon a primitive story, he is accused of having stolen Laban's heart (vv.$^{22.\,26}$). Similarly there are two versions (J and E) of Jacob's encounter with Esau, and one—the older L—of his encounter with Elohim. After a stimulating discussion of the

Joseph stories, in which the seemingly isolated ch. 38 now finds its natural place in L, Dr. Eissfeldt proceeds, with this four-source key in his hand, to unlock the exasperating literary riddles of Exodus. It has long been recognized that in J the agent of the plagues is Jahweh, and in E, the rod of Moses: Dr. Eissfeldt traces here also the strand L, which always seems to speak simply of *the rod* (cf. $7^{15.17.20}$)—a manifest allusion to the rod of 4^{1-9}, which, for good reasons, can belong to neither J nor E, and must therefore also be assigned to L. Long ago Professor Bacon, in his *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, made merry over the inexplicable and gratuitous ascents and descents of Jahweh in Ex 19: here again the four-source theory comes to the rescue. Again it is pointed out that in L and E the Sinai story ends in a shrill discord, in J with a friendly promise (33^{1-3a}). It is impossible here to indicate, much less to follow out, the subtle analysis which is conducted as far as Jg 2. Suffice it to say that in Jos 1–12 (where, according to Dr. Eissfeldt, P hardly, if at all, exists)—*e.g.* in the stories of the capture of Jericho, of the sin and doom of Achan, and notably of the crossing of the Jordan (3 and 4), with its inextricable confusions—the hypothesis of a source additional to J and E comes as an unquestionable relief, and—Dr. Eissfeldt would say—as a positive necessity.

Peculiarly interesting is his explanation of the curious story in Ex 4^{24-26} which, by skilfully comparing with the theophany and circumcision stories in Jos 5, he regards as L's account of the consecration of Moses, parallel to the story of his call told by both J and E in Ex 3.

The general conclusion to which he comes is that L is the primitive source reflecting the nomadic ideal, belonging perhaps to the time of Elijah, and embodying, like that great prophet and like the Rechabite Jonadab, a protest against the Canaanizing of Hebrew life. In this connection it is significant that this is the document which narrates the drunkenness of Noah and of Lot, in stories, too, which—especially the latter—betray the rough and unsophisticated vigour of an older time. J, which dates from the prosperous first half of the eighth century, rejoices in Canaan, the land of promise, and in all the settled life of the land. E, which reflects the prophetic movement and comes from the time of Amos and Isaiah, attaches again to the nomadic ideal, regards Canaan as a peril, and, like the prophets, threatens the people with catastrophe (cf. Ex 32^{34}, which does not necessarily imply that the blow of 721 B.C. has already fallen). Dr. Eissfeldt thinks that the place of origin of these documents is in need of further discussion, as too much has been made of the phenomena which point to Judah as the home of J and Israel as the home of E. The spiritual unity of the kingdoms, he remarks, antedated their political separation, just as there was a spiritual unity among the various peoples of Germany long before the establishment of the German Empire, and they could and did rejoice in one another's folk-tales and legends.

The elaborate critical discussion is followed by a complete translation of the narrative part of Gn 1^{1}–Jg 2^{9} in four parallel columns, L, J, E, P, which facilitates comparison and enables the reader to trace in comfort the history of the tradition of the various events. If Dr. Eissfeldt's analysis is, as it seems to be, justified, every historian of the Hebrew people or their religion will be obliged to reckon with it. This is a most suggestive, searching, and brilliant book.

J. E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

Jesus and Judaism.[1]

This volume reveals all the learning and care which we are accustomed to expect from Professor Dalman. It seems to us that in the First Part he gives a fully convincing proof that Jesus habitually spoke in Aramaic, and he gives various instructive suggestions as to how we are to make sure of understanding the Aramaic which the Master used. We must confess, however, to belong to those for whom it makes little difference to know the exact words employed by Jesus. The precise phrases seem so unimportant compared with the greatness of the whole.

Dalman mentions that he had intended to call the book *Jesus und Judenthum*, and, while he adopts another title, that remains his real subject. It would have been highly valuable to have got from an expert like our author a careful examination of the fundamental principles of Jesus in their relation to Judaism, but instead we have got

[1] *Jesus-Jeschua*, by Professor G. Dalman (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1922, pp. iv, 222; 7s. 9d.).

something entirely different. After the opening linguistic section, he discusses—II. Jesus in the Synagogue; III. Jesus as the Preacher of the Sermon on the Mount; IV. Jesus at the Passover, in which he deals very fully with the various accounts in the Gospels of the Lord's Supper and many of the associated problems; and V. Jesus on the Cross.

As a rule, of course, the treatment of these subjects is illuminating. One extraordinarily unfelicitous discussion occurs on pp. 57–62, where Dalman's treatment of a real difficulty must be pronounced a failure, owing to his ignoring the assistance of literary criticism. But it must be said that the learned and suggestive paragraphs which we have are really little more than a collection of notes on the relevant passages from the Synoptic Gospels. We have come to expect something more fundamental from a scholar of Dr Dalman's grasp and power.

H. A. A. Kennedy.

New College, Edinburgh.

Contributions and Comments.

St. John vii. 37, 38.

There are three difficulties here: (1) What is the source of the quotation? (2) Why does the quotation apply to Christ's disciples rather than to Christ Himself? We should naturally expect it to justify the claim, 'If any man thirst, let him come to me.' (3) The remarkable and rather bizarre application of the word 'belly.'

Loisy (*Le Quatrième Evangile*, 1903, p. 522) avoided the second difficulty by rendering, 'If any man thirst, let him come to me, and let him that believeth on me drink.' As the Scriptures said, 'rivers of living water shall flow from *His* belly,' with allusion to the blood and water that flowed from the side of the Crucified.

Burney (*The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 110) adopts the same rendering of the first clause, and finds the same reference to Christ in the quotation by reconstructing an Aramaic original which should have been rendered, 'As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow from the fountain of living waters,' thus solving both the last two difficulties. For 'the fountain' with a Messianic application Dr. Burney refers to Jl 3^{18} and Midrash Rabba on *Ecclesiastes*, par. 1. 28.

It is the purpose of this note to support both the writers quoted in their punctuation of the first clause. They both note that such a rendering is not modern, but was that of ancient Western interpreters. We may add that there is much to be said in its support from considerations of Johannine style. *E.g.* for the parallelism and vocabulary of

> ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρός με
> καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ

compare 6^{35}:

> ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ
> καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε.

Further, it seems usual for this writer to speak of 'coming' to Christ absolutely and without such further addition as 'and let him drink.' Cf. *e.g.* $6^{35.\ 37.\ 44.\ 45.\ 65}$. There is a rather remarkable parallel to the first line in Rev 22^{17}, καὶ ὁ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω. This would be still stronger if with ℵ* D. Cyp. we omit πρός με in Jn 7^{37}. For the variation of order in the two clauses, 'If any man thirst, let him come, and let him drink who believes in me,' cf. 7^{24}, 'Judge not superficially, but the righteous judgment judge ye,' and other instances adduced by Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 2556.

Of course it may be argued that the ordinary rendering of these verses, with their teaching about the disciples of Christ being receptacles of living water, finds strong support in 4^{14}, 'the water that I shall give to him shall be in him a spring of water leaping up to everlasting life.' But there is no reason why $7^{37.\ 38}$ should simply repeat the teaching of an earlier occasion. And in $7^{37.\ 38}$ a quotation from Scripture, if employed at all, seems necessarily to find its application in justifying the claim, 'If any thirst, let him come,' by showing that the

Messiah was to be a source of living water. Just as the discourse on the heavenly food (ch. 6) finds its culmination in the saying, 'I am the bread which cometh down out of heaven,' so this saying upon spiritual water naturally finds its climax in something like, 'I (not merely "my disciples") am the fountain of water of life'; and the comments of the crowd suggest that they understood Him to be applying Scripture to Himself.

Loisy's rendering of the passage solves the second difficulty with which we started. Dr. Burney solves also the third, and by his substitution of 'fountain' for 'belly,' and his reference to Joel and to Jeremiah 2^{13}, provides a better answer to the first question than other commentators have done.

It may be noted in conclusion that v.[39] is quite in accordance with the rendering of vv.[37. 38] adopted above. 'He spoke this (about Himself as the Source of living waters and as therefore able to give water of life to every one of His disciples) with reference to the Spirit which He would later impart to them.' A rather superficial application of 'his' to the disciple has led to the supposition that the quotation referred to Christ's disciples, and has necessitated the connexion of 'he that believeth in me' with the words that follow instead of the words that precede that clause. If Dr. Burney is right in his suggestion of an Aramaic original, the present text and its interpretation has passed through three stages: (1) Dr. Burney's original Aramaic with 'fountain'; (2) a Greek text with κοιλίας αὐτοῦ instead of 'fountain'; (3) the connexion of 'he that believeth in me' with the following words.

WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN.

Saham Toney.

Note on Job xvii. 11.

יָמַי עָבְרוּ זִמֹּתַי נִתְקוּ מוֹרָשֵׁי לִבָּבִי.

THE Revised Version translates, 'My days are past, my purposes are broken off, Even the thoughts (marg. Heb. possessions) of my heart.' This is what the text means as it stands. It is fairly clear, however, that the LXX is right in joining מוֹרָשֵׁי לִבָּבִי to נִתְקוּ. This version renders:

αἱ ἡμέραι μου παρῆλθον ἐν βρόμῳ
ἐρράγη δὲ τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς καρδίας μου.

'My days passed in noise,
The joints of my heart were broken,'

thus producing two lines in place of the three of the Massoretic Text. If we accept this division of the verse, what is the original word of which זמתי is the corruption? Duhm reads צמתו, which he places after נתקו, in which he sees a corruption of מִתְקָוֶה. He thus reads:

יָמַי עָבְרוּ מִתְקָוֶה צִפּוּתוּ מוֹרָשֵׁי לִבָּבִי.

'My days pass without hope; they destroy the wishes of my heart.' The corruption of מתקוה into נתקו is, however, not easy to see, and the suggested removal of נתקו and זמתי from their position in the verse can only be described as arbitrary. The true reading is suggested, it seems to me, by the LXX rendering ἐν βρόμῳ, which Duhm declares 'leads us nowhere,' but which, I think, leads us to the original reading: בְּזַעַם, 'in indignation' (*i.e.* of God). The emended text would then be יָמַי עָבְרוּ בְזַעַם, 'My days have passed in indignation,' that is, suffering the anger of God.

זַעַם, 'indignation,' is used of men in one or two passages, *e.g.* Hos 7^{10}, but more commonly of God. Cf. Is 30^{27} שְׂפָתָיו מָלְאוּ זַעַם, Nah 1^{6} לְפָנָיו זַעְמוֹ מִי יַעֲמוֹד, and especially Is 26^{20} חְבִי כְמְעַט־רֶגַע עַד־יַעֲבָר זָעַם, where זַעַם is used almost as a proper noun, 'Indignation,' a good illustration of our passage. The LXX paraphrased בְּזַעַם by ἐν βρόμῳ, 'in noise,' 'in roaring,' thinking of the idea of 'noise' and 'sound' suggested by בְּזַעַם, and incorrectly interpreting it to refer to Job's condition, *i.e.* 'my days have passed in tumult.' Cf. Hab 3^{12} for another LXX paraphrase of זעם which they usually translate by ὀργή, but which they render there by threats'—בְּזַעַם תִּצְעַד אָרֶץ = ἐν ἀπειλῇ ὀλιγώσεις γῆν.

The use of נִתְקוּ, with the abstract מוֹרָשֵׁי in the second part of the verse, is paralleled by another passage in Job, namely, 18^{14} יִנָּתֵק מֵאָהֳלוֹ מִבְטַחוֹ, where the A.V., as it seems to me, gives a better rendering than the R.V. The A.V. renders: 'His confidence shall be rooted out of his tabernacle.' The R.V. renders: 'He shall be rooted out of his tent wherein he trusteth.' The R.V. has been guided, I think, by the desire to avoid construing the abstract noun מִבְטַחוֹ as subject of יִנָּתֵק. The harshness of R.V., from the point of view of Hebrew construction, is apparent, and, in view of the use of נָתַק in the passage נִתְקוּ מוֹרָשֵׁי לִבָּבִי,

unnecessary. This same desire of finding something concrete as the subject of נִתְּקוּ, which has led the LXX to translate מוֹרְשֵׁי by ἄρθρα, 'joints,' seems to have led to the comparison with the Babylonian *maḫrašu*, 'cord,' *i.e.* 'the cords of my heart have been snapped.' (See the footnote to Kittel's text.) This latter derivation is, however, not etymologically possible. A far more reasonable derivation of מוֹרָשׁ is not from יָרַשׁ, 'to possess,' but from the Assyrian *êrêšu*, meaning 'to desire,' 'to request,' found once in Hebrew also in Ps 21[3] אֶרֶשֶׁת שְׂפָתָיו. Compare for the formation מוֹסָר, 'a band,' from אָסַר.

Accepting these suggestions, we have a well-balanced couplet giving a sense which well agrees with the context:

יָמַי עָבְרוּ בְזַעַם | נִתְּקוּ מוֹרְשֵׁי לִבָּבִי.

'My days have passed in (or, under) indignation, the wishes of my heart have been pulled out.'

B. B. Lieberman.

Worcester College, Oxford.

The Codex Vaticanus on Romans ix. 5.

In the long note on the punctuation of this verse in the classic edition by the late Dr. Sanday and Dr. Headlam, it is said (p. 234 in ed. 5): 'The strongest evidence against the reference to Christ is that of the leading uncial MSS.,' and again, 'The difference between the MSS. and the Fathers has not been accounted for and is certainly curious.' This can only mean in the context that the leading uncials are supposed to demand a full stop after σάρκα. But in the same paragraph it is explained that the *Sinaiticus* has no punctuation, while the *Alexandrinus* is so free with points and spaces that 'there is no reason, as far as punctuation is concerned, why ὁ ὤν should not refer to Χριστός as much as οἵτινες does to ἀδελφῶν.'

The note goes on: 'B has a colon after σάρκα, but leaves no space, while there is a space left at the end of the verse. The present colon is, however, certainly not by the first hand, and whether it covers an earlier stop or not cannot be ascertained.' I would submit, however, that in any case the *Vaticanus* presents no more difficulty than the *Alexandrinus*. I have inspected carefully the Vatican phototype of 1889, and find a similar colon without a space after σάρκα at the end of Ro 9[3], after both occurrences of Ἰσραήλ in v.[6], after Ἀβραάμ in v.[7], Ῥεβέκκα in v.[10], and αὐτοῦ in v.[22]. These instances will doubtless be judged sufficient to settle the point.

The only other uncial cited is the *Ephræmi Rescriptus*, and we are merely told that 'C has a stop after σάρκα.' Perhaps after what has been said some scepticism may be permitted as to the significance of this; but it may be possible to obtain further details from Paris.

Cuthbert Lattey.

St. Asaph.

The Theophany at Horeb (1 Kings 19).

The interesting suggestions of Professor E. L. Allen on this subject in the issue of The Expository Times for February 1922 prompt me to forward another explanation which has occurred to me.

(1) When Elijah met Obadiah, the herdsman of Ahab, as he was seeking pasture for the king's horses during the drought, Obadiah seems to wish to insist on the fact that there are 100 loyal prophets of Jehovah hidden in a cave. Elijah does not pay much attention to this fact, and at Carmel he acts as though he alone were left of all the prophets of Jehovah, who have not bowed the knee to Baal.

(2) When, in his subsequent flight from the anger of Jezebel, Elijah is resting beneath a tree, angels bring him food. This seems to be a message to Elijah in his weariness that Jehovah is with him, providing for him and seeing to his safety. Therefore he has no business to be running away. He should be trusting in Jehovah for his security, and facing the wicked queen, after the conquest he had made on Carmel. This ministry of angels brings him strength, and he finds that he can continue his journey.

(3) The renewed strength should have carried him back to his work. But when he finds his strength renewed, and he is able to walk, he walks away still farther—right down to Mount Horeb. That he should not have done this is indicated by the question with which the theophany at Horeb opens, viz.: 'Elijah, what are you doing here?'

(4) By way of excuse Elijah insists that he alone is left of the prophets of Jehovah. There is no

mention of the 100 of whom Obadiah spoke. The answer comes through the wind, earthquake, fire, the still small voice. Now it seems a possible interpretation that the wind, earthquake, and fire are intended to represent Elijah himself. His preaching and work have so far been of the nature of these. His duty was to denounce strongly and sternly the wickedness of Jezebel and Ahab and the Baal-worship. He has foretold the drastic punishment of the drought, he has discerned the coming storm which closed the drought, and he has vindicated Jehovah before the people by fire from heaven. But Jehovah now announces that He works by other means as well. Quietly and secretly His work has been going on among the people, like the still small voice. There are these 100 prophets whom Elijah ignores, and who have been doing useful service somewhere. And Jehovah announces that there are 'seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.'

(5) Then Elijah is led forth to anoint Elisha to be his successor. The subsequent work and character of Elisha suggest, on the whole, the still small voice, rather than the wind, earthquake, and fire, which was the work of Elijah.

MALCOLM MCQUEEN.

The Manse, Noorat, Victoria, Australia.

Shaddai.

ACCORDING to the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*, the etymology of the divine name *Shaddai* is doubtful. The conjecture which perhaps meets with the greatest approval is that it is derived from the root *shādad*, and means 'almighty.' I wish to suggest that the difficulties of the name are removed if we suppose that the old Hebrew or Canaanite deity Shaddai was not a god, but a goddess. An original Mother-goddess, Shaddai was converted later into a god. As G. A. Barton (*A Sketch of Semitic Origins*, 1902) and others have shown, this happened fairly often. A. H. Sayce notes, for instance (*Babylonians and Assyrians*, 1900, p. 13 f.), that, when the worship of the Babylonian goddess Ishtar was carried to Southern Arabia and Moab, 'she became a male divinity, and in the latter country was even identified with the supreme god Chemosh.'

The name *Shaddai*, I submit, is connected with *shad* (also *dad*; cf. Arab. *thad*), 'breast.' The form is intensive, and the ending is an old feminine termination which survives in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and probably in Hebrew (*e.g.* in *Sarai* for *Sarah*). For another name derived from the same noun, we may compare the *Thaddæus* (Syr. *Thaddai*) of the New Testament (Mt 10^3, Mk 3^{18}).

Shaddai was the big-breasted or many-breasted deity. It is well known that in various parts of the world the Great Mother has been represented with large or multiple breasts. The Babylonian Ishtar is represented with prominent breasts (Morris Jastrow, *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1915, p. 218, pl. xxix. fig. 3). Nintu, a form of the goddess Ma, is represented with a babe suckling her breast (Donald A. Mackenzie, *Myths of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 150). G. A. Barton (*op. cit.*, p. 210) notes that 'in the middle Babylonian period the image of a nude goddess holding her breasts was very popular in Babylonian art.' In images from Northern Syria, the Great Mother is represented with her hands proffering her breasts (H. A. Strong and J. Garstang, *The Syrian Goddess*, 1913, p. 15). The Great Mother (Snake Goddess) of Crete is depicted with 'enormous breasts' (Mackenzie, *Myths of Crete*, p. 59). At Tiryns 'a number of terra-cotta female idols, with exaggerated breasts, and terra-cotta cows, which had evidently a religious significance,' were found by Schliemann (*ibid.*, p. 89). These seem to have been connected with the goddess Hera. It may be added that, according to C. G. Jung (*Psychology of the Unconscious*, 1916, p. 488), 'it is very characteristic of the archaic thinking of the child for the breast to be designated as "mamma."'

That Shaddai was a fertility deity is clear from such passages as Gn $17^{1f.}$ 28^3 35^{11} 43^{14} $48^{3f.}$. There seems to me to be a hint of this also in Job 22^{23} ('if thou return to Shaddai thou shalt be built up'—born again?) and 33^4 ('the spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of Shaddai giveth me life').

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

Manchester.

'In Season, out of Season.'

ON p. 82 of his book, *The Meaning of Prayer*, Dr. Fosdick writes: 'When Paul said to Timothy, "Be urgent in season, out of season," he was giving that advice which a wise experience always gives to immaturity: Make up your mind in advance

to keep your course steady, *when you feel like it and when you don't,*' thus taking Timothy's own inclination to be that by which the seasonableness or unseasonableness is determined. Most of us, I imagine, have taken St. Paul to mean, 'Whether your hearers feel like it or whether they don't.'

To all who have so understood the words it may be of interest to know that the Greek commentators understand St. Paul somewhat as Dr. Fosdick does. Thus St. Chrysostom says: 'What is "In season, out of season"? It is this, do not have a fixed season; let it be always season to you; not only when in peace, in freedom from fear, nor only when seated in church, while in perils you draw back. Nay, even if you be in prison, if you be wearing a chain, if you are about to go forth to death, and at the very moment of death itself, convict men, do not shrink back from rebuking them.'

The authority of the Greek commentators is weighty, where the question is purely a question of Greek. And the adverb εὐκαίρως and its cognates constantly denote our own convenience or leisure rather than that of others. Μὴ εὐκαιρεῖν is 'to have no time,' 'to be too busy' (Plutarch, ii. 223 D). A person seeking an audience is told οὐκ εὐκαίρως ἔχειν τὸν βασιλέα, 'that the king is not at leisure,' 'that the king cannot conveniently see him' (Polyb. v. 26. 10). Εὐκαίρως περιπατεῖν is 'to take a walk when it suits us' (Plutarch, ii. 1071 D). And ἀκαίρως has to follow suit. Εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως is simply 'whether convenient or not.' And Greek and common sense are at one in bidding us add 'to yourself.'

G. H. Whitaker.

Woughton, Bletchley.

Βάρος and Φορτίον.

Gal 6[2. 5] reads: ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει. It seems a pity that the A.V. and R.V. do not attempt to bring out (or rather, the A.V. does not, and the R.V. only quite inadequately by a marginal note) the difference between these two words. βάρος, I take it, is the crushing, unfair burden, the burden which ought not to be on the man's shoulders at all, but his own folly, or the selfishness of others, or his waywardness of life has placed it there. φορτίον is the load which may be heavy, even a bit irksome, but a man can bear it all right. It will tire him, probably, but it will not kill him; he and it are adapted to each other; it is, so to speak, his 'tare.' No one else can, or should, bear it for him; so long as he is healthy-spirited, he will not wish any one to do so.

I have no dignified suggestion for translating v.[5], but, for a rough approximation to the meaning, suggest, 'Every one must pull his own weight.'

Arthur Jones.

Bristol.

Entre Nous.

TWO TEXTS.

Matt. v. 45.

'"That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." I have deliberately cut off and separated one clause of a sentence from the teaching of Jesus as the subject round which our thoughts shall gather. If it seems an arbitrary thing to do, a kind of literary vandalism, I can only plead that the clause might as fitly include other sentences from the Sermon on the Mount as the one which is before us.

'The truth it contains expresses the inner motive and spirit of the Christian life, and can by no means be bound down to any particular injunction or command. It gives us a glimpse of the end in view in this high business of attempting to govern life by the laws of Christ; it therefore reveals the motive and driving power which lies behind every venture of Christian faith and service. This is the secret passion round which all the romance of Christian history is written, the heartfelt desire that, come what may in life, the spirit of man may bear the marks of kinship with his Creator and Redeemer.

'The Sermon on the Mount has been called the lawbook of Christ, and in a slightly different vein it has been regarded as a vivid picture of the Kingdom of God as that kingdom is mirrored in the portrait of a citizen. We see here the divine

society as society is seen in terms of personal living and its spirit. Christ's way of showing us the kingdom is, after all, the only way by which to estimate any society justly. You cannot reckon the stage that society has attained by passing in review its outward organization and wealth; society must be judged by the kind of man it produces and upon whom it rests. One of the shortest, as it is certainly one of the most satisfying, pictures of the new world which we are still talking about was that given by the prophet Isaiah centuries ago. "A king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. And a man shall be as a hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." It is man and not a type of government which fills the old picture, and I can realize that society better than many which have been described to me through the complex details of a new social machinery.

'Now, the Sermon on the Mount is Christ's picture of what a man shall be in the new kingdom. Through it all, He is saying to us a man shall be this, and this, and this; and as He builds up the picture of the man, the vision of the kingdom grows before our eyes. My text forms part of that picture, and just as man is the heart of the kingdom, so the text takes us to the heart of the man. He lives with this supreme passion ruling his heart that he may be a child of his Father who is in heaven.

'I do not believe that you can see this man of the kingdom at all except through that dominant motive. Take the motive away and this spirit of forgiveness and forbearance and generosity, carried to limits that the world would reckon insane, becomes as unbelievable as the world holds it impracticable.'

This quotation is from a sermon by the Rev. Sidney M. Berry, M.A., which is published in the last half-yearly volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (Clarke & Co.; 7s. 6d. net). This is the one hundred and twenty-second volume of *The Christian World Pulpit*, and it makes as good reading as any of its predecessors. It contains about one hundred and fifty sermons, representing almost as many preachers.

---

1 Chron. xxii. 7, 8.

'Among Lord Aberdeen's papers at this time [after his failure to avert the Crimean War] is found a text which, his son says, was written by him more than once and at different times on various scraps of paper. The words stand alone, and seem placed to meet the eye constantly.

'"And David said to Solomon, My son, as for me, it was in my mind to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God: but the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars: thou shalt not build an house unto my name, because thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in my sight" (1 Chron. xxii. 7, 8).

'Lord Aberdeen, in the long tenure of his estates, had built many new churches, manses, and schools, and had great pleasure in these estate improvements. The manse of Methlick was about this time rebuilt on a new site and in a better manner. The parish church was old and dilapidated. "I leave that for George," said his father, when his attention was drawn to the bad condition of the church. This was very unusual conduct on his part, and the reason was never suspected, even by those who knew him best, till after his death, when his papers disclosed his belief that he was debarred from his privileges as a heritor and a churchman "because thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in my sight."'[1]

SOME TOPICS.

Intelligence.

Psychology is the preoccupation of many minds at present, and there is no subject which is so prolific of literature. There is a considerable amount of confusion in the science owing to the number of different schools and the variety of meaning attached to familiar terms. It may almost be said that psychology is in its pioneer stage, and new theories multiply with the increase of hardy explorers. Among these must be numbered Dr. J. Varendonck, the writer of *The Evolution of the Conscious Faculties* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). The author of a treatise on 'The Psychology of Day-dreams,' which was very favourably received, Dr. Varendonck has in this new volume pursued the suggestions of his former studies, and gives his account of the whole content and activity of the mind. He captivates us by his candour and earnestness, and by his constant references to concrete experiences; but his book is not an easy

[1] *The Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen*, ii. 299.

one to read. He is so full of matter that he often stumbles over his own digressions. But if this book needs careful and meditative reading, it is an able, serious, and important contribution to its subject.

It is difficult to compress a long and detailed argument into a few lines. But, briefly, its main points are these. 'Intelligence' is the term used for the whole of the mental processes, conscious and unconscious. Intelligence and consciousness are not synonymous terms. The former is far wider than the latter. That is one point. Then, further, the fundamental factor of the mind, the basis that supports the whole structure, is memory. Memory is the key to everything. In one of its forms, *e.g.*, it is the condition of perception. There are two forms of memory. There is reduplicative memory, which simply registers events. And there is synthetic memory, which organizes experiences and associates like with like. It is when the mind does this that it perceives. 'A synthesis of images,' as Ribot says, 'is necessary to get beyond the stage of feeling and arrive at perception.' But what of the inner process itself, the thought, idea, conception? That is simply the adaptation of revived memories to a present situation under the influence of 'affect' or will. And consciousness? That is always the result of choice. A mind is conscious because it chooses. Consciousness is not a mere cognitive function. It is rather the reaction of the mind to the outer world. In the writer's own words: 'It is that part of intelligence which is organized for the reaction against the outer world, for the adaptation to the non-ego.'

Such is a bare description of some of the findings of this ingenious mind, in an essay which will doubtless receive the careful consideration of psychologists. Dr. Varendonck is throughout indebted to Freud; but he has a very fresh and independent mind, and his theory will have to be taken into account.

Sin.

The pastor of the West End Presbyterian Church in New York, Dr. A. Edwin Keigwin, has published a volume of sermons to which he gives the title, *The Meaning of Life* (Doran; $1.50 net). Dr. Keigwin deals with the questions, 'What is Life?' 'What is Spirit?' 'What is Sin?' 'What is Democracy?' 'What is Death?' and 'What is Resurrection?' in successive sermons.

Here is his own synopsis of the chapter on sin. 'The natural history of sin. Tracing the morbid phenomenon to its source. Isolating the germ of the sin-disease. Finding the antitoxin. Symptomatic remedies not effective so long as there is "the lost sense of God."' The text of the sermon is the fourth verse of the fifty-fourth Psalm, and the sermon is better for British readers than the synopsis suggests. To the question, 'What is Sin?' Dr. Keigwin answers that sin is more than its symptoms —more than murder or thieving or debauchery. 'Sin is something back of any particular manifestation. What is this something?

'David's snapshot is the answer. Here sin is visualized with the fidelity of a camera. "Against thee, thee only have I sinned." *Sin is impaired spiritual circulation*—the interrupted flow of the Divine will—an embolism of a soul's arterial relation with the mind, the heart, the very life of God.

'Nothing is so enveloped in a mist of divergent theories as the nature of disease. Yet ask almost any physician of standing what is the primal cause lying back of all physical disorders, and he will answer, "Impaired circulation." Although discovered scarcely more than three centuries ago, the circulation of the blood has been, from the making of man, the determining factor in the health of the race. Since this discovery immense progress has been made in every branch of therapeutics. And greater progress will be made in moral therapeutics when it is more generally realized that as circulating life is the basic principle throughout the universe, so it is in the soul and in society.

'The story of spiritual circulation is as simple as it is wonderful. Gushing forth from springs in the heart of the Infinite, a rich red river winds its tortuous way through a veritable *terra incognita* of human impulse, desire and will, distributing the Spirit and Will of God whithersoever it goeth, at the same time gathering up all impurities, yea even deposits of evil, and carrying them back to God's heart of love, where man's contaminated spiritual energies are purified and sent forth afresh. Whatever clogs or otherwise impairs the circulation is sin; which is but another way of putting the time-honoured definition, "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." By law the Westminster divines meant not so much God's organized law as His organic law—His law of life.'

NEW POETRY.

Norman Ault.

The Poets' Life of Christ (Oxford University Press; 7s. 6d. net) is an anthology compiled by Mr. Norman Ault which cannot fail to be a useful addition to the minister's 'work' books. The poems in the collection range in point of date from the middle of the fourteenth century to the present day, but the spelling and punctuation of the older poems have been wisely modernized. Well-known poems found in hymnaries have been deliberately excluded.

As the title of the volume indicates, the poems are not arranged in their chronological order, but in such a way as to tell the story of Christ's life from the Annunciation to the Ascension. This handsome little book, which is decorated by the compiler, should prove to be a mine rich in illustrative material.

One or two extracts will show the plan of the work.

THE BOY JESUS.

Once, measuring his height, he stood
  Beneath a cypress tree,
And, leaning back against the wood,
  Stretched wide his arms for me;
Whereat a brooding mother-dove
Fled fluttering from her nest above.

At evening he loved to walk
Among the shadowy hills, and talk
  Of Bethlehem;
But if perchance there passed us by
The paschal lambs, he'd look at them
In silence, long and tenderly;
And when again he'd try to speak,
I've seen the tears upon his cheek.

THE SYRO-PHŒNICIAN WOMAN.

'*It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it unto the dogs.*'
'*Yet the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.*'

Had Christ rebuffed me as he did that mother,
  I had been mortified so bitterly,
My smarting pride, all further speech to smother,
  Had filled my heart with such black ecstasy
  The miracle had ended differently—
  The fiend had left my child, but entered me.

Yet if I'm human, was she so much better?
  Or saw she something which the books omit—
Christ's eyes a-twinkle, as he spoke, that set her
  Though whelmed in trouble, catching at her wit?
  Did he not laugh, who owned her 'saying' fit?
  And if he then blessed humour—cherish it.

'EARLY, WHILE IT WAS YET DARK.'

All night had shout of men and cry
  Of woeful women filled his way;
Until that noon of sombre sky
  On Friday, clamour and display
Smote him; no solitude had he,
No silence, since Gethsemane.

Public was death; but power, but might,
  But life again, but victory,
Were hushed within the dead of night,
  The shuttered dark, the secrecy.
And all alone, alone, alone
He rose again behind the stone.

Hugh I'Anson Fausset.

The Condemned and the Mercy of God (Selwyn & Blount; 6s. net), by Mr. Hugh I'Anson Fausset, is a bonnie book beautifully printed on fine paper, and Mr. Fausset's work is almost worthy of it. Everywhere there is a rush of movement, and often fine sonorous lines, and many a vivid metaphor that grips and haunts, aptly sketched and applied. But in character drawing he has not the knack of winning his reader's sympathy. 'The Condemned' is the musing of a murderer the night before his execution. His had been a bare life till a woman came into it, the wife of another man, whom he regards as utterly unworthy of her. He gives her a clean worship—so he says—yet, when at the pinch she shrinks back from him to the other, he murders the husband; but, his love soured to hate, he thinks with passionate disgust of the woman who, he holds, has failed through lack of character. The impression left on the mind is that of a poor sniveller who has dared and lost the game, and whines. True, he rallies at the end and meets his fate with decency, but too late to win one's respect. It worries him that the world will believe him actuated by mere jealousy.

And not one friend in all this earth remain
To start up boldly and call out, You lie!

But the reader agrees with the world, and acquiesces in its verdict.

'The Mercy of God' is a somewhat luridly told tale of a nun, condemned by her brother to matrimony to restore the family fortunes, who, in her agony on hearing of the fate in store, appeals to God, and in answer finds to her awed delight the mark of plague upon her hand—a fine theme; but again one has but little interest in either the brother or his bloodless sister. Mr. Fausset can do better than this, and he will.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It was about time that some one should help us with our stocktaking on the subject of the credibility of the Gospel records. Some speak of the 'Jesus myth,' and others regard the 'Jesus cult' as an unfortunate aberration of the early Church influenced by the 'mystery' religions. To some Jesus is an apocalyptist, to others a pacifist; while there are those who tell us that what we get in the Gospels is not the story of Jesus but the reflexion of the mind of the Apostolic Church. Where exactly do we stand? Bishop Headlam has tried to tell us in a volume with the title *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, which is noticed on another page.

The Bishop of Gloucester has not the faintest desire to 'make our flesh creep.' He thinks too many have engaged in this amiable pastime. He has no new and startling theories to propound. The impressive thing about this volume is just that an author who long ago made good his place in the front rank of New Testament scholars, writing with full knowledge of the criticism of this generation, including the 'freak' criticism of the last year or two, can yet adopt a position on the whole so conservative. We say 'on the whole,' for Bishop Headlam, cautious as he is in his general outlook, adopts the critical position with regard, *e.g.*, to the composition of the Synoptic Gospels, and is no more convinced than the rest of us that the Fourth Gospel is a literal account of the ministry of Jesus.

But though the Bishop does not object to be numbered among the higher critics, he will not go all the way with them, nor indeed very far. He will not concede that Matthew, *e.g.*, has 'faked' his material. (The word is his own.) We point out that the first Gospel has a tendency to omit descriptions of Jesus' personal feelings and emotions, and disparaging references to the Twelve; and we ask: 'Does this not mean that a growing and false feeling of reverence is at work on the records?' Dr. Headlam has two answers. Those omissions are only examples of the undoubted fact that Matthew shortens Mark's narrative, and a *précis* has never the vitality of the original. Further, Matthew inserts as well as omits. He deals very faithfully with St. Peter. 'O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?' 'Thou art a stumbling-block.' If Matthew wishes to exaggerate the miraculous, why does he abbreviate practically every miracle that he records?

On this subject of miracle again, Bishop Headlam, while willing to advance so far with the liberals, shows the same cautious reluctance to be led into advanced positions that may prove untenable. The Temptation story is not a literal account of actual events. Has not Origen himself pointed out

that the narrative describes in picturesque figurative language the temptations to which Jesus would be exposed? But the story of the feeding of the five thousand is not so easily disposed of. We must not assume on *a priori* grounds that the event did not happen as described. We should rather recognize that something happened 'so wonderful as to stir up the people in a remarkable way.' Dr. HEADLAM hesitates to accept rationalizing explanations even of the walking on the sea and the stilling of the storm. The reverent attitude is a certain 'suspense of judgment.'

He is not particularly grateful to the psychologists who point out the analogy between many of Jesus' miracles and healing by suggestion. The analogies are great: the differences are greater. 'There was a power and authority about our Lord's actions which was unparalleled then as it is unparalleled now.' After all, psychology is an infant science. The physical sciences change their view of what is possible with a rapidity that should give pause to the dogmatist; and the historical evidence for most of the miracles (not for all) is of great weight.

On the whole subject we could wish that Dr. HEADLAM had taken us more into his confidence. Discussion of such questions as the Virgin Birth (he repeatedly refers to the Virgin with a capital V), of the son of the widow of Nain, of Jairus' daughter, and of Lazarus, to say nothing of the Resurrection of Christ, is possibly excluded as not coming under the scope of this volume; and yet its omission leaves a certain blank in a book which professes to deal with the credibility of the Gospel narratives.

The author's expression of his judgment on disputed points is always a model of the humility and courtesy of the Christian scholar. 'I am not prepared to say exactly what happened at the Transfiguration.' 'I do not myself feel certain of the historical character of all the early stories about our Lord.' 'May we identify Bartholomew, as has often been done, with that Nathanael, "the Israelite in whom was no guile"?' There is only one unworthy sentence in the book, the sneer at the 'singularly meagre morality of the modern temperance devotee' (p. 223). We can hardly think that whisky, or even champagne, is essential to a full Christian morality.

One more question from Dr. HEADLAM. What did Jesus mean when He spoke of the Kingdom of God? Are the apocalyptists right, who tell us Jesus believed that God was about to make a catastrophic irruption into the whole earthly scheme of things, and that Jesus would shortly return as the Messiah from heaven, destroying the evil and establishing His Kingdom? Or are those right who say that for Jesus the Kingdom of Heaven is within us? Or are we to trust the ecclesiasts who believe that by the Kingdom Jesus meant the Church? One difficulty in deciding is that the supporters of each theory can point to proof texts, and Dr. HEADLAM is too good a scholar to adopt the common solution of fixing on one theory and then excising all texts that seem inconsistent with it.

We have always thought of the parables about the Kingdom as given spontaneously by Jesus; but is it not more likely that they were spoken in reply to questions? And if so, does that not suggest that Jesus' first hearers were as much puzzled by the phrase 'the Kingdom of God' as more modern disciples? We have too readily supposed that the explanation of the parabolic method which Mark ascribes to Jesus—'that seeing they may see and not perceive'—is a late and foolish theory of the Church. When scholars tell us that the parables are self-explanatory we have to point in reply to the bewildering history of their interpretation. If experts to-day can differ so widely in the meaning they find in the 'Kingdom' parables, how unintelligible they must have seemed to those who first heard them! They were waiting to hear when Jesus was going to lead them against the Romans, and what they heard was a story about a farmer sowing his seed!

What, then, did Jesus mean by 'the Kingdom' in these parables? The Kingdom is not a new revelation to come from heaven in the future, but a process going on now; it is 'a new state of things.' It is not exactly the Christian Church: that is too narrow an interpretation; and yet the Church is a visible representation of the Kingdom, of the new power at work in the world. More than this: the Kingdom will be the final consummation of all things. Nor are these three different and contradictory interpretations of the 'Kingdom' idea; they are but three aspects of the one great thought in the mind of Jesus.

One of the events of the past month has been the publication of what may be regarded as a Manifesto of the Low Church party in the Church of England. It is in the form of a large volume with the title *Anglican Essays*: A Collective Review of the Principles and Special Opportunities of the Anglican Communion as Catholic and Reformed (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net). The writers include Dr. C. F. D'Arcy, Archbishop of Armagh, Archdeacon W. L. Paige Cox, the Rev. Charles E. Raven, and Archbishop H. Lowther Clarke. None of these names is, perhaps, specially well known, but the essays (which are mainly on the facts and issues suggested by the historical Reformation) are written with full knowledge and by competent hands.

The position occupied by all the writers is a central one, between the extreme Anglo-Catholics on the one side and the extreme Evangelicals on the other. They desire to give full play to the scientific criticism of the sacred texts and to make the search for truth the task of a perfectly liberated intellect. But they are loyal to the 'essentials of the Faith,' and contend that in these the modern world can find the guidance it needs amid its perplexities. The strength and the great opportunity of the Church of England, it is contended, lie in its central position. In an age of shrieking partisans and revolutionaries, an institution which holds the middle path has something of inestimable worth to give to mankind.

That is the general contention of these essays, and it is put with remarkable force and persuasiveness by Dr. D'Arcy in the opening chapter on 'Christian Liberty.' The great need of the world to-day, he says, is an ordered liberty. A disorganized world is threatened with dissolution because liberty has become licence. The Christian Church, which brought to the world the true principles of freedom, very soon became a prey to the temptation associated with power and exercised a domination over the human intellect which is at variance with the whole spirit and aim of Jesus in the Gospels.

It was out of the conflicts provoked by this spiritual tyranny that there sprang 'that splendid progress of the mind of man which gave to the world a fresh civilization, a magnificent development of science, and a new ideal of political liberty.' The essence of the Reformation lay in this, that God and the soul of man were face to face, no human authority having a right to intervene.

But this raises the whole question of authority. Liberty may easily become unregulated and fall away to something of less than no value. Where is the seat of authority in Religion? Without such an authority you could not well get such a consensus of belief as would bring individuals together in that fellowship which was obviously one of the intended fruits of Christianity.

'The example of science points out the way to the solution of our problem. In this realm the most complete liberty of thought brought about a general agreement, an order never before attained. Liberty, in fact, re-established authority: but it is an authority which must always be ready to submit to correction when fresh knowledge is gained. This harmony is the result of the dominance of a spiritual principle—Reason.'

In the realm of religion a solution has been

rendered difficult by the way in which Bible and Church have been contrasted as rival authorities. Both have been weakened in any such claim by the progress of events. Division has largely robbed the Church of its authority and critical methods have undermined the traditional authority of the Bible. But in one important matter Church and Bible agree, in their testimony to the primitive Christian tradition or Rule of Faith. This is the fact of greatest moment, and in this witness we have a common basis of assurance.

When we push the question home, How are we to have guidance as to the meaning and application of the fundamental facts in this Christian Rule of Faith to the growing needs of mankind and the new problems of every age? we are led on to the point at which the answer to our whole problem is found. There is an authority which is superior to both Church and Bible and to which both bear witness, Christ Himself. He is the Divine Logos, the dominating Word, or Reason, of the whole creative process. And as Reason brings order and agreement in the free world of science, so the Divine Reason brings order and liberty into harmony in the free realm of souls. It is only control by a spiritual principle that can ever harmonize liberty and order. In the religious realm the solution is found in personality, and in one Personality that is the root of humanity.

The proof of this is found in the teaching of Jesus Himself, where emphasis on the value and freedom of the individual soul is combined with the order of obedience to the Divine will. If this be so the great need of the world to-day is the unification of the Christian forces, which will allow the influence of Christ to be brought to bear on the life of man. No more hopeful movement in this direction can be found than the 'Lambeth Appeal.' There are in it the essential conditions of an ordered spiritual commonwealth and at the same time scope for a wide diversity of types of Christian ethos. If this 'great adventure of the Spirit' is in any degree successful, the Anglican Church will have reason to recognize the Providence which, through long centuries, has kept it in the middle path.

In the January number of the *Church Quarterly Review*, Dr. T. H. Robinson has an important article on 'Modern Criticism and the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament.' It will arouse interest and probably keen discussion.

Up to the end of last century scholarship in general was fairly well agreed as to a view of the Prophets. Two distinct classes of persons, it was held, were known as prophets in ancient Israel. There was little common to the two except, for some obscure reason, the name.

On the one hand there were those comparable to a mixture of Dervish and medicine-man. They fell into frenzies and did extravagant things. They were consulted on trivial matters such as the finding of lost articles, and in some cases seem to have enjoyed no more than a dubious measure of esteem. On the other hand there were men, like Isaiah, who in the political sphere were far-sighted statesmen, and in the sphere of religion were spiritual geniuses.

The latter type knew little if anything of ecstasies. They engaged in no dances or self-cutting or other practices which were the identification-mark of the Dervish type. They were essentially forth-tellers or preachers. They spoke or wrote 'sermons' and they published books. There was little tendency to dispute that on the whole the prophetical books, except Isaiah, were issued as books by the authors whose names they bear.

A change of view, however, is now coming in. It is not yet known in America; it has but few representatives in Britain. But, if we are to believe Dr. Robinson, it is going to be the prevalent view at no distant date. The new view abolishes the clear-cut distinction between the two types of prophet. It believes that ecstasy was more or less

the normal way in which the great prophets, too, received their messages. It casts scorn upon the notion that the so-called schools of the prophets were in any way like the cloistered academies of study which some have pictured them. And in truth, the Old Testament itself knows nothing of such schools. It knows only the 'sons of the prophets.'

The consequences for our view of the Prophetical literature are far-reaching and important. If the prophet depended on ecstasy for his message, the messages must have been brief. Long-continued passages are scarcely to be thought of. The old idea that some verses are interpolations destroying the connexion in long passages is baseless, for there is no connexion to destroy.

How, then, are we to conceive of the growth of the books? In much the same way as we regard the growth of the Psalter. The brief oracles as they were received or uttered were written down, each on its own page. Collections of oracles were then made under the name of a distinguished prophet. They might probably be his own, but many a scrap of unknown authorship would be added. No chronological order would be regarded unless the oracles were definitely dated. Oracles which related to the same or kindred subjects would naturally be placed together.

Hence we need not be surprised if the arrangement appears to be sometimes haphazard, or if the same oracle should appear in different books or be repeated in the same book. It follows, if this view of the growth of the books be correct, that a great number of oracles are probably by unknown and unnamed prophets. We know not whether the prophet himself, or some other, wrote them down.

Dr. Robinson would have us regard this point as one of small importance. 'Profoundly valuable as are the personalities of an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, an Ezekiel, a Hosea, or an Amos, no true critic would ever dare to limit the activity of the Spirit of God in the revelation of His will and character. Beside the message itself the messenger is insignificant. The newer study has served to bring home to us the sense of a wider scope and a broader field for the play of divine inspiration.'

Books continue to pour from the press on the subject of spiritualism. One of the most interesting and enlightening of these recent volumes has the misleading title, *Do the Dead Live?* (Murray; 5s. net). The writer is a French journalist, M. Paul Heuzé, and a very lively person he is. His style is conversational and informal, and no reader could possibly be uninterested for a single moment, the book is so full of incident and personalities distinguished or bizarre. The sub-title of the book describes its contents far better than the title: 'An Inquiry into the Present State of Psychical Research.'

M. Heuzé made his plans carefully and was very successful in the execution. He chose certain prominent persons as his authorities and interviewed them in turn to secure reliable information on various points. M. Delanne, an ardent spiritist, was asked to explain the doctrine and faith of spiritism. Dr. Geley expounded the experiments of the 'Metapsychists' in regard to 'materialization,' purely scientific experiments. Professor Richet and M. Camille Flammarion were asked for pros and cons on the subject. Mme. Curie was interviewed as a pure scientist. M. Maeterlinck and Father Mainage are among the others who contribute valuable chapters.

The two points the book deals with are: first, the question as to the reality of the phenomena, and, secondly, the interpretation of the phenomena that are admitted as real. On the first question there is a great deal to be said, and M. Heuzé says it. The reality of many of the phenomena is doubtful, For one thing most of the well-known

mediums, says M. Heuzé, have been caught cheating. He mentions instances and quotes M. Flammarion, who writes in one of his well-known books: 'I can say that during forty years practically all the famous mediums have visited me in the Avenue de l'Observatoire, and that I discovered most of them cheating.'

Besides this, stories are told which, on investigation, prove to have no foundation, yet they are repeated and multiplied by famous people as authentic. M. Heuzé cites the story about Lord Dufferin in Paris, and the apparition who warned him not to go on a lift at a certain hotel where he was attending a diplomatic reception. The whole story is given in striking and impressive detail, but when M. Heuzé investigated the incident, he discovered that there was no foundation for it whatever. Mr. John Murray, the publisher, confirms this in a note.

But taking the phenomena that are real and genuine, what is the explanation of them? There are serious objections to the spiritist explanation, the difficulty, *e.g.*, about the clothes in which spirits appear. Where do they get these? But apart from such points, M. Heuzé quotes three explanations given by various of his authorities. One is that some of the phenomena are explained as efforts of the sub-conscious, *e.g.* Père Mainage says that 'always and everywhere the tenor of the said messages is an exact reflection of the thoughts of the persons who are inquiring: the Spiritists accurately register the echo of their own thoughts.' Confirmation of this may be found by any one who will read Stainton Moses' 'Spirit Teachings,' and compare it with the recent 'Guidance from Beyond' of Kate Wingfield. Not only is the style of the spirits in the former book the style of Mr. Moses himself, but their rationalism is the rationalism of Mr. Moses; whereas the 'Guidance from Beyond,' through Miss Wingfield, is orthodox Trinitarian doctrine.

Another explanation given is that many of these phenomena are manifestations of the psychic forces of the *living*. They are sometimes due to mind-reading and sometimes to clairvoyance. We have many very striking instances of people seeing places at a distance and incidents which were occurring miles away from where they were, and there are authentic examples of men who are able to read the mind like an open book. If such psychic powers exist in certain select cases, we may well suspend judgment in cases where at present an explanation is not available. So much that was mysterious is explicable on natural grounds that we may be content to wait.

One striking observation may be quoted from M. Flammarion. These phenomena at least prove that 'apart from our body there is a psychic element endowed with special faculties . . . capable of operating outside our organism, we know not how. Time and space do not count with it. . . . Our cerebral cells bathe in the unknown: we are bound up with all that exists, I mean all natural forces, by an inextricable network of waves and vibrations, and thought itself is an agent which operates through space.'

Eternal Life and Deification.

By the Reverend J. S. Stewart, B.D., Edinburgh.

The keynote of the Johannine literature is struck right at the beginning of the Gospel: 'In him was *life*; and the life was the light of men' (Jn 1^4). That note is constantly recurring. Do the readers seek an explanation of the presence of the Son of God among men? The answer is here: 'I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly' (Jn 10^{10}). Do they inquire how the Son can communicate to them such a gift as that? 'Jesus saith . . . I am the

life' (Jn 14^6). Do they ask the secret of the joy and assurance which prevailed in the Christian community? 'We know that we have passed from death unto *life*' (1 Jn 3^{14}). And the original writer of the Gospel makes no effort to conceal the definite aim that was constantly before him, determining at every point the form of his work: 'These are written, that ye might believe . . . and that, believing, ye might have *life*' (Jn 20^{31}).

Now the Johannine conception of eternal life has often been investigated, and it may fairly be claimed that with regard to many aspects of the doctrine a definite amount of agreement has been reached. Thus, for example, we can say with something approaching certainty that John conceives eternal life as a present, spiritual possession, capable of development, the presupposition of immortality, waiting only to be sealed by a final act of God. It is at once a gift of God and a surrender of the soul. It is a moral fellowship and a supernatural unity with Christ and with God. It includes all that is meant by salvation.

But there is one question which has called forth very divergent answers. That is the question as to the method by which eternal life is imparted by God to man. Within recent years strong attempts have been made to trace a parallel between John's teaching about the communication of life and the idea of 'Deification' which played so large a part in Hellenistic religions. Such an attempt is made in Bousset's work *Kyrios Christos*, which may be taken as a fairly typical example of the method and results of the modern 'religious-history school.' A new (posthumous) edition of this book recently appeared. Bousset starts out from the fact that the culminating point in the mystery rites was the ἐποπτεία, the vision of the Godhead. Crude, naïve means were originally used in order to present this vision to the initiates; but gradually ecstasy became the way by which the desired goal was reached. The sight of the Deity thus vouchsafed conferred immortality: it carried with it participation in the life of the god himself. The salvation for which men were yearning and which the contemporary syncretistic religions claimed to be able to provide was represented as deification through the vision of God. How far, then, was the Fourth Evangelist indebted to this environment? Bousset replies that John took over the whole conception: what was new in his presentation of it was the place given to the fact of Christ. Bousset's own words run thus: 'This vision which deifies man attaches itself to the image of the Son of God who has appeared upon earth.'[1] The main proofs of Johannine dependence are found in the mystical tendency of his view of life; in his frequent collocation of the terms θεωρεῖν, γινώσκειν, and ζῆν; in the supposed absence of any real connecting links with the religious ideas of the Old Testament and the Synoptics; and, above all, in the thought which repeats itself in various forms throughout both Gospel and Epistle, and which clothes itself in language reminiscent of 'mystery' terminology: 'This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which *seeth* the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting *life*' (Jn 6^{40}). The absence of the actual expression 'deification' is not held to constitute a difficulty, since by the time when the Evangelist wrote, the idea of eternal life was fully synonymous, and it would be at once understood by his readers in the light of the current mystery conceptions.

Such, in outline, is Bousset's interpretation of John's view of life. Is his position really justifiable? Two points must be observed. In the first place, while we need not hesitate to admit that at first sight certain striking parallels do undoubtedly appear between the two views, the Hellenistic and the Johannine, it must be insisted that the resemblance exists only on the surface. Nothing is more dangerous than to suppose that because John works with conceptions which were familiar in his Hellenistic environment, he cannot have given them an entirely different content. It must be remembered that his thought was largely moulded by the Old Testament, by the Synoptic tradition, and by the Pauline theology. Above all, we must constantly remind ourselves that his was a creative spirit which had for long years been in direct contact with Jesus Christ. It was through this personal intercourse that his unique view of eternal life came to clearness in his mind. It is impossible that this, his supreme contribution to religious thought, should have resulted from a mere superimposing of the fact of Christ upon the schemes of salvation that dominated his environment. Theories of mechanical dependence will be severely shaken if due weight is allowed to those words recorded in Jesus' farewell conversation: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the

[1] *Kyrios Christos*, p. 168.

Spirit of truth is come . . . he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you' (Jn 16^{12-14}). 'These words,' Titius has well said, 'frankly imply a programme; they show the principles on which John has written his Gospel.'[1] The earthly ministry of Jesus had not disclosed all that eternal life could mean: something was left for the Holy Spirit, working in the Evangelist's mind, to reveal. But the revealing Spirit was still the Spirit of Jesus; and consequently the new truth had fundamentally nothing in common with the non-Christian cults. 'He shall receive *of mine*,' said Jesus, 'and shall shew it unto you.'

The second counter-argument to Bousset's deduction of the Fourth Gospel's view of eternal life from the Hellenistic idea of deification consists in the vital importance assigned by John to the fact of faith. The emphasis laid on that fact is the measure of the difference between the two conceptions. No inner reconciliation between them is possible. The term ἀποθεοῦσθαι in the Hermetic literature carries with it semi-physical associations; and these are absent from the Evangelist's view of life. In the latter, complete self-surrender to Christ is the keynote, and that has nothing in common with ecstatic vision. It is not he who sees the Son of God, but only he who sees Him and believes in Him, who has eternal life (Jn 6^{40}). That life is God's gift, but the human will must be active in its reception. It is a new nature, not in the sense of a higher essence mysteriously imparted, but as being the transformed state of the human soul which responds in faith to Him who was lifted up from the earth to draw all men unto Himself.

It is improbable that the school represented by Bousset would ever have made use of the idea of deification if due weight had been given to the fact that the Johannine conception of life, on its mystical side, runs back to the basal idea which Paul had expressed in his formula ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. A thoroughgoing dependence of the later writer upon the earlier is of course not to be considered: the very last thing which any man can borrow is his personal mysticism. But the Evangelist has had that same overwhelming experience of being 'in Christ' which coloured all Paul's thought. Long reflexion on the meaning of that wonderful manifestation of God's glory in Jesus has led this writer into the deepest mysteries of the Christian life. Constant new discoveries of the self-imparting power of the risen Lord have confirmed him in his idea of what it is that distinguishes true life from the barren existence which he can define only as death. The Christian has eternal life because he dwells in the sphere of the life of the exalted Christ. This interpretation of John's thought finds confirmation in the fact that in his Gospel the references to the deep, mutual relationship between the disciples and their Master are confined almost entirely to the departure speeches, where Jesus' mind is occupied with His coming exaltation. It is true that in the allegory of the Vine and the Branches the words, 'Abide in me, and I in you' (Jn 15^{4}), seem to imply an existence of this inward life-relationship independent of the coming death and return to glory; but this is due to the Evangelist's tendency to stress the timeless aspect of Christ's person. The great theme of the life 'in Christ' which rings out in the Gospel is heard also in the Epistle, which reaches its climax with these words: 'We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life' (1 Jn 5^{22}).

Deissmann has argued that since the formula ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ appears first in the Pauline Epistles, its use there must constitute a unity: that is, the full mystical idea is present wherever these or kindred words occur.[2] Whether that can be proved true in every case or not, it is certain that when John speaks about the dwelling of the believer in Christ and of Christ in the believer, he is reflecting the deepest and most intimate elements of the Pauline thought. It is possible that there were writers in the sub-apostolic age who used these expressions without meaning to convey all that they had meant in the hands of their original creator. But to the writer of the Fourth Gospel, the words 'in Christ' can never have degenerated into a mere piece of theological terminology, nor were they reduced to being a synonym for 'Christian' as opposed to 'non-Christian.' If any difference between Paul and John does exist here, it is not that the latter weakens the thought of the former, but rather that he draws it out and casts fresh light upon it. The great ideas among which Paul moves, death and resurrection, faith, justification, union with Christ—all have their place in the Fourth Gospel's view of life. All of them are fused together

[1] *Die johanneische Anschauung unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, p. 105.

[2] *Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu,'* pp. 70–79.

in one of the greatest sentences the Gospel contains: 'The Son of Man must be lifted up,' said Jesus, in words which unite the thoughts of crucifixion and exaltation, 'that whosoever believeth should have everlasting life *in him*' (Jn $3^{14.15}$).

In Paul, the relation of the believer to Christ is expressed in terms of faith, which is the utter surrender of the life to the grace of God which comes seeking men in Jesus Christ. In opposition to Bousset, it is necessary to emphasize the fact that faith holds a very similar place in the thought of John. In particular, there is an essential connexion between faith and the reception of eternal life. The sentence quoted above implies that in some way the participation in life is bound up with belief. No words express more definitely the vital place occupied by belief in the Johannine theology than these: 'He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life' (Jn 3^{36}). Now it is important to observe that the frequency with which the ideas of believing and knowing are brought together does not necessarily imply that the spiritual content of the Pauline conception of faith has been replaced by a merely intellectual element. It is clear that the element of assent to the truth of certain events enters largely into the Johannine presentation of belief, and in this respect it may be granted that his thought is moving on a lower plane than that of Paul. Again, in so far as 'belief' centres in the outward confession of the Messiahship and the Divine Sonship of Jesus, it is something less than the faith which means union with Him. But deep down beneath those features of the Evangelist's thought in which the controversies and developments of his own generation can be most clearly traced, there lies something which approximates to the full inwardness and grandeur of the Pauline 'faith.' For with John, 'belief' remains ultimately a personal matter, the product of a deep religious experience, an acceptance of the Son of God, not merely with the intellect, but with all the power of the will. The Johannine conception of eternal life is robbed of half its meaning when his use of πιστεύω is interpreted as though it had no place for that attitude of the soul in which it goes out to meet the love of God. It must be remembered that the idea of 'believing' in the Fourth Gospel includes various stages: for example, there is the belief called forth by miracles, and there is the belief called forth by the overmastering impression of the Person of Christ. The former type may grow into the latter, or it may remain barren and soon disappear. In any case, they represent very different positions; and the Johannine idea of true belief must be deduced from those passages where it is seen at its highest. The earlier, more undeveloped species of belief is able to lead up to the knowledge of the presence of God in Christ; and this knowledge, this γνῶσις—which is never merely theoretical—contains potentially the complete surrender of the soul, that is, the highest form of belief, which may well be dignified with the name of 'faith.' This supreme faith, consisting in the believing submission of the will and response of the whole nature, is really poles asunder from the first stage of wondering assent called forth by outward, visible σημεῖα. It is the distinguishing feature of the sons of God. It is the presupposition of eternal life, and the hallmark of its present possession.

Now when the Hellenistic idea of deification is analysed, it is found to consist of many varied elements; but it is in vain that one looks for any trace of faith. Therefore, since faith is the factor which, according to John, plays the most crucial part in the reception of eternal life, Bousset's position is untenable. His tendency to discover the roots of most of the great New Testament doctrines in the contemporary mystery-cults has led him to do violence to what is one of the most characteristic elements in the Johannine theology.

One other point should be noticed. Those who hold the 'deification' theory claim to find additional support in John's presentation of the *rebirth* in which eternal life begins. But here again their argument depends upon analogies between the Fourth Gospel and the mystery literature which exist only upon the surface. The prologue to the Gospel identifies those who believe with those who have been 'born of God' (Jn $1^{12.13}$), thus pointing forward to the great discourse on Regeneration in chapter 3. It has never been sufficiently emphasized that by his use of the word ἄνωθεν, the Evangelist completely transformed the ideas of rebirth which were prevalent when he wrote. The entrance upon eternal life was conditioned, not by any vague renewal of the nature which could be obtained by prescribed means, but by a birth from above, from God, who alone could give men power to become His sons. The presentation of the Christian life as beginning in this way would no doubt have a special

appeal for many minds. Wendland[1] has shown how great was the emphasis laid by the Stoic preachers of morality on the necessity for an inner transfiguration and for the winning of a new life; and the materials collected by Lietzmann[2] witness to the prevalence of the conception of regeneration in the chief contemporary religious cults. The initiate was 'born again,' *in æternum renatus*, and the day of this consummation was his *natalis sacer*. Whether such ideas were consciously before the Evangelist's mind may well be doubted; unconsciously, his thought may have clothed itself in terminology which reflects current usage. But the important point to observe is that here again, as throughout his whole view of life, John stands directly related to Paul and to Jesus. Paul's experience of the Divine creative power which had laid hold on him when all his own striving had proved unavailing embodied itself in the triumphant assertion that 'there is a new creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ' (2 Co 5^{17}: Moffatt)—an assertion which contains essentially everything that John proclaims about the new, heavenly birth. And above all, the conversation with Nicodemus reminds us of those words out of the earlier tradition: 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 18^{3}). It is completely misleading to argue that because in the Synoptic saying stress is laid on the human activity, while in the Johannine the human factor is regarded as passive, no true parallel exists between the two passages. The Fourth Evangelist is not forgetting the attitude of the soul in which it turns to God: he is expressing the truth that even that attitude itself is ultimately a Divine work. To assert, as Heitmüller[3] does in a discussion of the conception of the birth from above, that 'it is mere trifling to adduce' the saying recorded by Matthew, is quite unjustifiable. John draws out the truth implicit in that saying. In this world where flesh and spirit are radically opposed, only they can become as little children who are carried over into the higher, spiritual realm—who are born anew, 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God' (Jn 1^{13}).

A frank recognition of the fact that in this matter, as in most others, John stands in direct line with the Synoptic Jesus and with Paul removes the necessity of ascribing to the initiatory rites of pagan cults an influence upon Christianity which would gravely challenge our estimate of the essential originality of the Christian faith. And it appears likely that ere long the 'modern religious-history school' itself will be compelled to revise radically its view as to the sources of the Johannine conception of eternal life.

[1] *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, pp. 85 ff.

[2] 'Römerbrief,' in *Handbuch zum neuen Testament*, pp. 62 ff.

[3] *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Bd. v. col. 2010.

Literature.

THE HISTORICITY OF THE GOSPELS.

The credibility of the Gospel records has been attacked from so many sides and from so many different points of view that a fresh dispassionate study of the whole question by so competent a scholar, so sane and reverent a critic, as the Bishop of Gloucester is an event of outstanding importance. The title which Dr. Headlam has given to his book is *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ* (Murray; 12s. net). It is frankly a treatise on apologetics, written to reassure those whose faith has been shaken by attacks on the historicity of the Gospels. If it errs on the side of excessive caution, it is a welcome fault in an age whose theological studies have been characterized by no little extravagance.

This work is only a fragment of a larger design. The author's discussion of the theological questions involved is, we understand, to come later. The earlier part of the book is devoted to a study of the sources, and of the 'background' of the ministry of Jesus. Dr. Headlam, while accepting the documentary theory of the Synoptic Gospels, thinks the discovery of 'tendencies' has been greatly overdone. All through, he has in his mind the question which some of his predecessors seem to have forgotten to ask: 'Do the theories propounded really explain the facts?' Of those who tell us that the

Gospels are only reflexions of the thought of the Church, he asks the very pertinent question: 'If the Church created the Gospels, what created the Church?'

Masterly chapters on the relevant history and geography, and on the religious and psychological atmosphere in which Jesus lived, shed a world of light on the Gospel story. There is a powerful section on the relations of Jesus and the Baptist. The author is inclined to attach more weight than is sometimes done to the record, in this connexion, of the Fourth Gospel, and points out the definite tradition of a close connexion between Jesus and the Baptist. But he is perhaps at his best in discussing such subjects as the bearing of the Sermon on the Mount, or the questions that have vexed the theological world of this generation: What did Jesus mean by the 'Kingdom of God'? Did He, and if so in what sense, apply to Himself such titles as 'The Messiah,' 'Son of God,' 'Son of Man'? How far was He influenced by apocalyptic thought? Everywhere we feel that we are in the hands of a reverent and competent guide who will not lead us away from the beaten track unless he is sure that the new way is better than the old.

POPULAR PSYCHOLOGY.

The dominance of psychology in the world of thought at present may be seen in the number of books that are appearing dealing with its applications in different fields of practice. The situation reminds us of what happened thirty or forty years ago when evolution was still a novel conception. It was applied all round in every direction, and we had the evolution of all kinds of phenomena, all traced through their stages of progress. To-day it is the turn of the 'science of mind,' and medicine, education, industry, and religion are all being brought under contribution to illustrate and enforce its theories. So far as religion is concerned we have recently had Mr. Thouless's admirable little book, which is a severely impartial exposition of what religious psychology is. And now we have a no less admirable work on different lines from the Rev. W. S. Bruce, D.D., of Banff—*The Psychology of Christian Life and Behaviour* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). It is on different lines, because Dr. Bruce's aim is practical. He knows the subject as a science, and has mastered the relevant literature, but he takes theory for granted, and asks what it means in the light of the facts. The object of the book is, briefly, to vindicate for Christian experience its reality as a normal element in life. It was the want of a better psychology that discredited the arguments of the older theologians. To-day we may find in psychology, properly interpreted, a new apologetic. The author is entirely in the right in this; and if his book is taken as a whole, and in its cumulative effect, it will be found to provide a strong reinforcement to faith.

But Dr. Bruce's purpose is even more practical than this. He visits the different regions of Christian experience and effort in turn, and points out the help psychology gives in interpreting experience and reinforcing effort. In particular he has a great deal that is of value to say about religious education and the whole matter of the development of religious life in the child. He points out also the immense help that psycho-analysis, properly used, might be in handling difficult religious problems and especially in ministering to souls. There are chapters on conversion, on revivals, on prayer, on evangelism, and there is a specially valuable treatment of auto-suggestion and the relation of the 'sub-conscious' to religious theory.

The book is from beginning to end immensely interesting, and we are specially impressed by two qualities of its author. One is his breadth of mental outlook, the other is the sanity of his judgment. He points out, *e.g.*, what very much needs to be said, that the abnormal in mental phenomena is no real guide and no real key to reality, but often quite the opposite.

THE DIATESSARON.

Sometimes even scholars play with diamonds, never dreaming of their value. Towards the end of last century, Dr. J. Bergsma published at Leyden an edition of two manuscripts of a Life of Christ, written in mediæval Dutch. He issued the volume simply for its linguistic interest to students of Dutch. But the theologians have now awakened to the value of the treasure thus accidentally found. The manuscripts are translations of the 'Diatessaron' of Tatian.

Dr. D. Plooij of Leyden has now published a preliminary account of the more important of the two, the Liège Harmony, a vellum MS. probably of the second half of the thirteenth century, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron* (A. W. Sijthoff's

Uitgeversmaatschappij, Leyden; 7s. 6d.). The actual translation, of which this MS. is a transcript, was apparently made about the middle of the thirteenth century. The importance of the find is that the translator worked from a Latin original. Hitherto all known Latin MSS. of the Diatessaron had belonged to the Vulgate tradition; but this translator worked from an Old Latin Text. Not only so; but the Old Latin Text (which has unfortunately not survived) was an independent translation from the Syriac, which, later, largely influenced the Old Latin text of the Gospels. The supreme importance of any discovery that brings us nearer Tatian's text is that that text 'is of the oldest nobility even in its latest descendants.'

The following, culled from a number of selected readings, will give some idea of the interest of the MS.: Jn 1^5 (agreeing with the Syriac but with no other authority), 'The light *was shining* in the darkness'; Lk 1^{78}, 'This will be on account of the tender mercy of our Lord who (which?) has visited us from on high from the Orient'; Mt 6^{11}, 'Do not abandon us in our temptations'; Lk 11^7, 'He who stands outside the door will go on calling (seeking?) and knocking at the door' (Jesus makes both 'seeking' and 'knocking' part of the lesson); Mt 25^1, 'They went out to meet the bridegroom and the bride'; Jn 4^{28}, 'She set down her crock, and ran into the city.'

Tatian was something more than a translator, and produced a 'first-class literary work.' Witness these renderings: 'The shepherd leaves the ninety-nine sheep in the desert or on the mountain *where they are grazing*' (*i.e.* he does not neglect them). The woman's drachma was a *gold* drachma. A bitter pill to the prodigal was that the hired servant had plenty of bread 'in my father's house.'

There is a characteristic introduction by Dr. J. Rendel Harris, who is collaborating with Dr. Plooij.

GOOD MEN WITHOUT FAITH.

Given a live subject and a live mind at work upon it, and a live book is certain. That is the happy combination in the short sketch (for it is little more), *Good Men without Faith*, by the Right Rev. Bertram Pollock, D.D., K.C.V.O. (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net).

Here is an honest man facing the problem that often thrusts itself upon us—the beauty of character, the large measure of Christlikeness of people who are outside of the Church, and non-believers in the faith. On active service, for example, where men lived herded together so close to each other that their real self could not be dissembled or concealed, but was known thoroughly in a week, one was frequently brought up against the rare unselfishness and bigness of nature of some who made no profession of religion, perhaps even scoffed at it. Yet they had, in great degree, attained to the character, or at least to some aspects of it, which is the end toward which religion is the means. There is the fact, from some angles surely extraordinarily blessed and happy and encouraging, and yet from others something of a puzzle. For John seems bluntly to deny that such a thing is possible; without faith in Christ, he feels, an unselfish gracious character just can't be. As Gore has it: 'We must ask this question, What would St. John say to genuine love divorced from right belief? He does not write as if he knew of its existence.' Well, we do. Dr. Pollock is frankly perplexed; he gives explanations, entirely satisfying so far as they go, yet he admits that they are only partial. But the point of his book is really this, that there are not two but three classes of people in the world—some unhappy souls antipathetic to Christ, who, seeing Him, recoil from Him or remain uninterested, and some who close with Him and become His more or less faithfully, and between these two some who are not Christ's, but who allow themselves to be acted upon by that Word that lighteth every man who does not with deliberation thwart and baffle Him. Or, to put it otherwise, Christ gives the Holy Spirit to His people because they have become able to receive Him; but those who are not Christ's, who have never had Him presented to their minds so as to see His beauty, but who do respond to the good and true, these are not abandoned by God—on them the Word is working, which is the same God as the Holy Spirit, but received in less degree: and in some natures that Word achieves very notable results. This little work calls up more questions than it answers: but it possesses that great merit in a book, it makes one think.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

To the innumerable books on the Psalter, Dr. W. M. Furneaux has added another—*The Book of Psalms: A Revised Version* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net)—whose object is not only to correct mistranslations, but 'also to be as far as possible free

from obscure and even unintelligible passages.' The use of quotation marks, the marking of divisions in the thought of the psalms, and the adoption of appropriate titles have added to the interest and the clearness of the translation. Dr. Furneaux has rightly drawn on the ancient versions and on critical emendations for the improvement of his text, with the result that familiar words are frequently replaced by others which more adequately represent the original thought. As examples may be mentioned the 'valley of gloom' in Ps 23^4; 'The voice of the Lord *shaketh the oaks*' in 29^8; 'Who knoweth the power of thine anger, or *feareth aright thine indignation?*' in 90^{11}; '*Learn well your lesson*, lest he be angry' in 2^{12}; '*I believe* that I shall see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living' in 27^{16}.

But occasionally important points are missed. Jehovah, *e.g.*, is rendered throughout as 'The Lord' (not even 'The LORD' as in A.V. and R.V.). In a version whose aim is to correct mistranslations, one might have expected a point like this to be recognized, especially in such a phrase as '*O Lord* our Lord' (Ps 8^1) instead of the much more significant '*O Jehovah* our Lord.' But this might be allowed to pass, considering that, by the time the Psalter was edited, Jehovah was no longer a merely national god, but the God of all the earth, and therefore, if you like, with the LXX and the later Jewish practice, 'the Lord.' But there are other points. In Ps 23^4 the emphatic *they* should hardly have been omitted in 'Thy club and thy staff comfort me,' nor should the concluding phrase 'throughout the length of days' have been rendered by 'for ever.' In Ps 42^2 the strong original phrase, which was quite certainly, 'When shall I come and *see the face of God?*' should hardly have been watered down to '. . . and *worship* before God.' In the very similar passages $72^{12\text{-}16}$ and $89^{9\text{-}12}$, with their interesting mythological reminiscences, the very emphatic *Thou* with which the verses begin in Hebrew should not have been ignored, and the 'Rahab' of 89^{10} is unquestionably not 'Egypt,' as Dr. Furneaux translates, but the mythological monster. Again, there is no good reason for suspecting the Hebrew text of 84^{12}, or for replacing its strong words by the weak paraphrase of LXX, 'The Lord loveth kindness and truth.' And as Dr. Furneaux is not averse to emendations, it is a pity that, in the fine description of the sea in $104^{26f.}$, he did not accept the emendation 'there go *the sea-monsters*,' for 'there sail *the ships*'—an emendation which, besides making a far better parallel to Leviathan, is alone consistent with the context. The ships could hardly be said to wait upon God and to receive from Him their food in due season (v.^{28}).

Dr. Furneaux rightly brackets, as unsuitable for worship, some of the verses in the Imprecatory Psalms. But if the last verse of Ps 137 has for this reason to go, as it should, why not also the two verses that precede it, which are conceived in the same temper?

A WANDERING SCHOLAR.

Principal Davies of the University of Aberystwyth has discovered and edited a very human document. It has just been published with the title *The Life and Opinions of Robert Roberts* (Cardiff: William Lewis). In form it is the autobiography of one of the sons of a Welsh peasant farmer, who with his wife and family of nine children lived a hard life of toil in a part of North Wales which is described as 'unlovely to look upon,' 'with a climate and soil cold, hard and cruel.' In reality it is as vivid a picture as has ever been painted, of the struggle for existence among the tenant farmers of that part of Wales during the 'hungry forties' of last century, and of the character of some of the bishops and clergy of the Church in Wales, and of the influence of some and lack of influence of others upon the religious life of the people.

Robert Roberts tells us how at three years old he had learnt to read his grandfather's large family Bible in the Welsh tongue. From childhood he was a book-worm, but education was hard to get. A bachelor uncle did much to help the boy, and at the age of seventeen he had himself become a teacher, and at the age of twenty-five a candidate for Holy Orders. Thus far he had fought a splendid fight against the hardships of a peasant's life in a most difficult time, but we gather that intemperance was the bane of his career. He was driven to emigrate to Australia, where this remarkable story of his early struggles is believed to have been written. He returned to this country to die in obscurity. But his autobiography as we have it is not the story of a tragedy. It is the story of a people and of their Church and religious life at a critical time, and it is told graphically. In some of the details there may be exaggeration, and in some evidence of malice, but for the most part it is

evidently a true tale told by one who had taught himself to read widely and to see past events with something of a spiritual vision.

MATTER AND SPIRIT.

On the old and ever-interesting problem of the relation of consciousness to brain, Professor J. B. Pratt has written a most readable book. The title is *Matter and Spirit: A Study of Mind and Body in their Relation to the Spiritual Life* (Allen & Unwin ; 7s. 6d. net). Professor Pratt grapples with one of the deepest problems that thought can entertain, and can set forth his exposition in such wise that all will be interested and all will understand. He makes a list of all the views of the relationship of mind and body that can be held, and proceeds to examine them critically, hoping that by a process of elimination the truth may be reached. His statement is accurate and his criticism acute and convincing. Materialism in its old and newer forms is shown to be untenable. Monistic idealism in its subtle vagaries is unsatisfactory too. Parallelism is at bottom faced with the same difficulties as materialism. What remains ? Well, the theory of interaction which at first seems so inconceivable is looked at again, and we are led to conclude that its difficulties are not insuperable or even serious. In all our practical life we see interaction at work, and count upon it. Thus responsibility is safeguarded. If we seem to be left with a frank dualism, Professor Pratt is well content to have it so.

It is always pleasant to come upon a medical man who is alive to the importance of mental science. This at least may be said of Dr. Charles W. Hayward, who is not only a retired doctor but also a barrister-at-law. He has written a book which he entitles (quite wrongly) *What is Psychology ?* (Allen & Unwin ; 7s. 6d. net). The title is wrong, first of all because the word ' psychology ' is used throughout the book in a sense quite unknown in the literature of the subject. His own definition is : ' Psychology consists of each and every one of those powers and subtle influences which go to make up the real " character," the true " ego " of each individual.' But, apart from that, Dr. Hayward's book is not so much an account of the science of mental phenomena as a discursive treatment of the facts of life, the evils of our time, the importance of environment, and the true way of creating a better world. There is a good deal of shrewd sense in many of its pages. The levity and moral laxness of our age are castigated with a firm hand. And many things are written about education and the training of the young that are sound and helpful. But any one who goes to the book for what the title suggests—a scientific exposition of psychological theory—will be disappointed. The value of the book is of a different kind, in its mingling of criticism and moral passion with suggestions of a way to better things.

Oh a trouble's a ton, or a trouble's an ounce,
Or a trouble is what you make it,
And it isn't the fact that you're hurt that counts,
But only how did you take it.

This may be described as the motto of a volume of three hundred pages on *Nerves and Personal Power* (Allen & Unwin ; 10s. 6d. net), written, one may say, on his death-bed by a Canadian doctor, D. Macdougall King, M.B. ' Affliction sore long time he bore,' yet he has two volumes to his credit, each of them written under the severest handicap of ill-health, with the sole object of helping others over similar ailments of body and mind.

Doomed to go in company with pain,
Turn his necessity to glorious gain.

In an introductory chapter to this book, the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King tells us that his brother, a doctor in Ottawa, was stricken with influenza complicated by double pneumonia. Tuberculosis of an acute type manifested itself after this attack. He sought recovery in a sanatorium in Colorado, and after long conflict he was able to resume the practice of his profession in Denver. But in the day of trouble he succeeded in writing a book on ' The Battle with Tuberculosis and How to Win it.' He had healed himself, and thought he had learnt how others might do the same, with like courage and discipline. But in two more years he was fighting a battle of another order. He was attacked with ' progressive muscular atrophy ' due to some organic nerve degeneration. ' It left no margin for hope ; it presaged the slow approach of death.' He resolved to die fighting, writing another book which he believed he could complete before the end came. Though in the end paralysed in body and unable to hold a pen, he was able to

finish his self-imposed task. If ever a man had won the right to preach courage to fellow-sufferers it is surely this man, who was actually made happy in his suffering by the hope that others would be helped and sustained in their time of need. Here in these ably written chapters he is virtually paying a score of visits to all manner of sufferers from nerve troubles, interpreting their feelings, explaining their symptoms, and above all stimulating their moral courage and aiding them in their daily conflict to win through. And none can say that its teaching turns any reader from dependence upon the Great Healer to a simple reliance upon his or her own efforts.

An interesting and, we are sure, a profitable course of lectures was recently delivered to Oxford undergraduates on the general subject of the foundations of personal Religion. Dean Inge lectured on Faith and Reason, Professor D. S. Cairns on The Father, Rev. W. F. Halliday of Woodbrooke on Man's Need, the Bishop of Pretoria on Christ, W. Brown, M.D., on The Practice of Prayer, and Father Frere of Mirfield on Christianity as Fellowship. The addresses are now published together under the title *Religion and Life: The Foundations of Personal Religion* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d.). They were all worth publishing and will all be found helpful. We commend Dr. Brown's paper to all interested in, or perturbed by, some aspects of the new psychology. He emphasizes what has been frequently argued in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—that it is absurd to take analysis of abnormal mental cases as a satisfactory or even very illuminating account of normal processes. It is, he says, comparable to identifying pathology with physiology. Further, he holds that so far from successful prayer being explicable as a kind of auto-suggestion, successful auto-suggestion is a kind of prayer.

Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor of the China Inland Mission had an alarming experience when they were captured and held as hostages for a short time by Chinese brigands. The story of this episode is told in *With P'u and his Brigands* (China Inland Mission; 2s. 6d. net). Incidentally the book throws light upon the distracted state of China, and closes with an impassioned appeal for an increase of missionary activity.

Teaching through the eye is both natural and effective. Most of us have a 'visual memory,' and many of us have a visual understanding. Hence the function of sacraments. All who are interested in the history of the Church in Scotland, then, will welcome the excellent graphic chart made by Mr. Robert Adams, Assistant City Librarian in Glasgow —*The Scottish Church, 1500–1920: A Graphic Chart* (T. & T. Clark; 3s. 6d. net). It is extraordinarily well done, and enables any one to see with comparative ease the ramifications of Scottish Religious History. The religious stream is coloured blue, and the various divergences and re-unions are carefully and clearly delineated. At the side of the Chart there is a list of the chief events and also a table of the chief authorities consulted. Nothing could be better for the study or the class-room. We note that an edition can be obtained cloth-mounted, varnished, and on a roller for hanging, at 12s. net. Mr. Adams must have spent an enormous amount of labour on this task, but the result has justified him; and that the work was a labour of love is proved by the dedication to all true lovers of the Scottish Church whose desire is to find a *via media* whereby all the divisions charted here may be blotted out.

Mr. Sheldon Knapp sees that two things are offered us in the New Testament, forgiveness and holiness, and that we often take the one and leave the other. Accordingly, he has written an earnest little pamphlet for children on how to become good. The title is *The Life Victorious* (Epworth Press; 4d.). It is the work of a kindly mind that relies greatly upon hymns. Not a little wisdom is to be found in these few pages.

Light on Mystic Art (Sheffield: published by the Author) and *Mystic Gnosis* (Letchworth: Garden City Press) are two books by Jane (Miller) Fisher. Concerning the former it may be said that, as Chesterton has proved that often in the blunt deliberate denial of the obvious and self-evident there lies another truth, so here there may be something for some minds. But we have failed to find it. It is a study of eight pictures in the National Gallery, such as Michael Angelo's 'Dream of Human Life': and the principle appears to be that everything is what it is not, and nothing what it seems. The four figures in Reynolds' 'Holy Family' are not really four, but only one, for to the enlightened the Mother is the soul, Joseph past

experience, the little Baptist repentance, and our Lord an active desire to do good to the world, etc. In the 'Vision of St. Jerome' the prone sleeping figure is not Jerome, as stupid people might assume, but 'body' in the abstract, while the very obvious Baptist in the foreground is not actually he, but a 'mystic interior state,' and so on indefinitely. Life is difficult enough without this kind of thing. And one fears that some ribald spirits may be inclined to push the principle so far as to declare that the Jane (Miller) Fisher of the title-page is not really a well-meaning lady but mental perversity.

The other is a more serious book, with some things true in it, and some questionable, and some mere darkness visible. And to it all one can apply the author's criticism of Maeterlinck, poor Maeterlinck, who is pure noonday sunshine compared with the twilight here: 'For our own part we consider the subjects of Mysticism, legitimate Symbolism, the veiled life of the Soul—which we can never thoroughly understand—sufficiently difficult without intentionally rendering them more obscure, more hopelessly unintelligible to earnest seekers and decidedly less attractive.' But the difficulty here is not, as she alleges of the other, the exuberance and beauty of the language. If anybody believes in Mr. Pryse he will enjoy this book.

The Drew Lecture for 1922 was delivered by Dr. W. Adams Brown, and is now published as *The Creative Experience: An Intimation of Immortality* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). The argument is neither very new nor very arresting. In brief it amounts to this: man is a creator, and in this life his creative function is never exhausted. He is often cut off before it has had opportunity to unfold itself at all. That he should survive this span of existence is therefore a reasonable supposition. This is just a specialized way of saying that human life is so valuable that it is worth preserving, which has for long been a familiar and in itself never a very convincing argument in the case for immortality.

Readers of fiction are often struck by the calm fashion in which religion is omitted as, apparently, a non-essential feature in the picture of humanity, as a kind of appendix in small print which can safely be left out without losing anything of the real story. And Mr. E. L. Strong, M.A., has been puzzled by a similar phenomenon. For he tells us that most recent books on psychology end where Christ's teaching begins: and he is fain to fill the gap and to carry matters further. That is a big purpose, which his book, *The Christian Character* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net), hardly fulfils. Yet it is a good book. Beginning with an introduction on the Christian character in general, too limited in its scope, yet admirable so far as it goes, the work becomes thereafter a commentary on the Beatitudes; or at least consists of far-reaching discussions that start out from these several texts. It is the book of a devout soul, and an interesting mind, in no way striking, but always competent and earnest and helpful. The writer's school of thought is revealed by such a fact as that, commenting on the poor in spirit, he devotes one paragraph to his declaration that 'they make the mystery of the Eucharist the centre of their life on earth.' But that is not typical, and in any case men of all schools can read this reverent work with pleasure and profit.

In *The Religion of Science*, by Mr. W. H. Wood, Professor of Biblical History and Literature in Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. (Macmillan; 6s. net), the author grapples with the claims of what he regards as the religion of scientific men who have discarded orthodoxy. He is disturbed by the progress of Evolution, the Higher Criticism and Socialism, and he seems to think that those who accept these doctrines give up any full-blooded positive religious faith and embrace a 'religion of science,' which is a poor substitute. Certainly the picture of this religion which the author draws, with gusto and in great detail, makes one's flesh creep. We agree with all he says of it in his closing chapter, but there are not the same signs on this side of the 'pond' of the degeneracy Professor Wood finds over on his side. We are more optimistic about the condition of the world, and especially the religious world, than the American Professor. Orthodoxy in America seems in a panic at present, but there does not appear to be any real reason for it.

Founded on the Rock, by Harriette E. Mitchell (Marshall Brothers), is a series of talks with young Christians on the Epistle to the Romans. It contains milk for babes, but little strong meat. No attempt is made to set forth the massive argument of the Epistle. The booklet is written in a devout but wholly uncritical spirit.

Realizing the importance at the present time of the question of Christian education in the churches, the Committee of the Young People's Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales appointed a Commission to hold an inquiry and report upon it. The Rev. Dr. Garvie was the chairman of a committee of ministers, laymen, and women which has now issued its Report, entitled *The Church as a School of Christian Education* (Congregational Union; 1s. net). Though this committee was denominational, its thorough examination of the whole subject and its recommendations, as set forth in the pamphlet of one hundred pages, are worthy of the attention of ministers and lay members of every religious body. They are not concerned merely or even chiefly with the religious education of the *young*. As to this branch of the inquiry it is admitted that 'the figures are challenging.' 'There are now nearly 108,000 fewer scholars in our schools than there were fifteen years ago, although there are the same number of teachers.' But within the sphere of religion the whole question is, 'What and how are we teaching our children, our young people, our adult members?' On the responsibility of all the churches for 'the continuous education of their own members and adherents in subjects related to the religious life' the recommendations and suggestions of the Report are undoubtedly deserving of the most careful and sympathetic consideration.

'Realising how the combined forces of evil—religious and reprobate—seemed to be centring their calumny upon "THE HOLY ONE OF GOD" (Luke 4. 34), and remembering a Conference held some twenty years ago when similar subjects were found to be confirmatory and stimulating, it was intimated that special issues of *The Witness* would be devoted to the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith.' These words will explain the origin and the nature of the essays in *The Seven 'V' Papers*, by Seven Well-known Writers (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. 9d.). They deal with 'The Virgin Birth,' 'The Virtuous Life,' 'The Vicarious Sacrifice,' 'The Victorious Resurrection,' 'The Veritable Presence,' 'The Valid Advocacy,' and 'The Verity of the Coming.' The treatment of these great subjects is specially adapted to those who belong to the extreme right wing of orthodoxy.

A new edition of *In the Heart of Savagedom*, by Mrs. Stuart Watt, has been issued (Pickering & Inglis; 5s. 6d.). It contains reminiscences of 'life and adventure during a quarter of a century of pioneering missionary labours in the wilds of East Equatorial Africa.'

The man in the street too often does not understand the preacher when he urges him to become a Christian. He does not understand the language of the Church. *What it Means to be a Christian*, by Edward Increase Bosworth (Pilgrim Press; $1.25), is a very laudable attempt to meet this situation and to state the vital truths of the Christian faith in the untechnical language of everyday life. Professor Bosworth has had considerable experience of student conferences in America, and is familiar with the religious difficulties that occur to men's minds. His handling of these is discursive rather than profound. The field covered is so wide as to preclude anything like adequate treatment of any of the topics touched upon. Still there is much that is suggestive in the book, and many useful hints are thrown out which will help the preacher to present the Gospel effectively to the modern mind.

When You Enlist, by Margaret Slattery (Pilgrim Press; $0.75), is intended as a gift book to be put in the hands of young people joining the Church. It depicts, in a series of vivid and interesting sketches, the onward march of the Christian army down through the heroic ages, and the question is pressed home, 'Who follows in their train?' The theme is treated with a freshness that is fitted to make a powerful appeal to the chivalrous spirit of youth, but there is, perhaps, too prominent a display of the Stars and Stripes.

In the interests of supernaturalism, Mr. Harold M. Wiener in *The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism* (Robert Scott; 5s. net) makes a gallant attempt to defend the predictive element in prophecy. Recent scholarship has indeed stressed the place of prediction, but not in a way that would satisfy Mr. Wiener, who believes that the prophetic 'messages frequently stood in little or no relation to the needs and circumstances of their own time,' and that pre-exilic predictions were occasionally fulfilled in the Maccabean Age, *i.e.* six centuries after they were delivered.

Few minds that have drunk of the modern spirit

will be convinced by the argument, though it is defended by a considerable array of historical knowledge. It would be no great compliment to a prophet to say that his message was irrelevant to the contemporaries whom he addressed, and the case is not seldom far from being so simple as Mr. Wiener assumes. One reason, *e.g.*, for denying, with the LXX, Jer 33^{17-26} to Jeremiah is that its regard for the Levites and the cult is entirely opposed to what we know Jeremiah's attitude to have been. Mr. Wiener hits the nail on the head when, in discussing Ezk 40–48, he speaks of it as an ideal rather than a prediction. This principle might be profitably extended over a far wider idea. The 'predictions' are often most reasonably regarded as ideals or hopes. If, *e.g.*, the warless world of Is 2^{1-4} ever eventuates, the important thing will surely be not that a prediction has been fulfilled, but that an ideal has been realized. We cannot afford to wait, and we do not need to wait, hundreds or thousands of years for the supernatural vindication of Israel's great men: their messages, so far as they matter to religion, vindicate themselves in our hearts and in the general course of history.

Dr. Donald Fraser, who is Moderator this year of the United Free Church of Scotland, has published, through Messrs. Seeley Service, a volume of *African Idylls* (6s. net). Some of the sketches are already known, as they have appeared in the 'Glasgow Herald' and elsewhere, but others are new. It is good to have them in book form, for they give us vivid pictures of life in Central Africa and the work of the missionary there. The sketches have the ease and charm we associate with all Dr. Fraser's writing.

A Glasgow professor, in order to emphasize the value of observation, 'prepared a little cupful of kerosene, mustard, and castor-oil, and calling the attention of his class to it, dipped a finger into the atrocious compound and then sucked his finger. He then passed the mixture around to the students, who all did the same with the most dire results. When the cup returned and he observed the faces of his students, he remarked: "Gentlemen, I am afraid you did not use your powers of observation. The finger that I put into the cup was not the same one that I stuck in my mouth afterwards!"' With anecdotes of this kind and a great deal of practical counsel, Mr. Cecil F. Walpole discourses on *The Building of Personality* (Skeffington; 1s. 6d. net). He deals with care of the body, memory, the value of suggestion, habit, imagination, and faith, and all of these and other topics he treats in the same light and helpful fashion. Young men and women would be much the better of a course of 'Walpole's Common Sense,' and especially of the stories with which it is driven home.

The Rev. Vivian R. Lennard, M.A., late Rector of Lower Heyford and author of several admirable volumes of sermons, has published a volume of addresses given at confirmation—*Confirmation Addresses* (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net). Some of these are addressed to general congregations, others to parents and sponsors; there are six for candidates before confirmation, and two to those who have just been confirmed. We commend them warmly. It would be difficult to find anywhere a better defence of the rite of confirmation than that advanced in the second of these general homilies. And it would not be easy to find addresses to young people beginning the Christian life more full of wisdom or more suited to their needs. The book deserves to be widely known. It would form an excellent manual to be put into the hands of candidates, but it would also offer wise and helpful guidance to young clergymen who are faced with the difficult duty of catechetical instruction.

With the new interest in Sunday School work and in scientific religious education, there is a demand for expert advice, and such a book as *Suggestions on Sunday School Work*, by the Rev. W. J. Brown, B.D. (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net), is invaluable. Mr. Brown is Director of Religious Education in the Diocese of Wakefield, and thus speaks from a wide experience. His counsels are intended for those who have had no previous training for their work (a large number, alas!), and the treatment therefore is throughout simple and direct. But his points are important, dealing as he does with discipline, attention (and how to secure it), method of teaching, preparation classes, efficiency, and training of teachers. All he says on these topics is well said and needs to be said. But, good as all this is, the best part of the book is the list of suitable literature he gives at the end. Mr. Brown does not hesitate to occupy half the space at his disposal with this bibliography, and it was worth the sacrifice. The books are carefully selected

and annotated, and the list and the notes on it are well worth the price of the whole volume.

Res Invictæ (Skeffington; 5s. net) is the title of a book of outline sermons by the Rev. F. L. H. Millard, M.A., Rector of Cold Norton and formerly Rural Dean of Carlisle. The author follows the Church's year and closes with five sermons for Harvest, Hospitals, Corpus Christi, Dedication, and Empire Day. 'These outlines,' he says, 'are not intended to be preached as they stand. They do not consist of headings and sub-divisions such as preachers generally look for in books of this nature. They are intended merely to supply thoughts upon which preachers can build their sermons.'

The life of *Alexander Duff*, by William Paton (5s. net), is the second of the series of new missionary biographies undertaken by the United Council for Missionary Education, and published by the Student Christian Movement.

The book gives in clear and attractive form all the facts of the life and work of this Pioneer of Missionary Education, and traces some of the results of his work, both good and bad, as they appear in the India of to-day. With the advent of the new and vigorous spirit of Indian nationalism, and the passing into Indian hands of the control of education in India to-day, we are faced with many new and grave problems, in meeting which it is probable that many changes will be needed in the educational missionary policy which Dr. Duff originated.

In this story of Duff's inspired personality and his ability to adapt new methods to the needs of his own day, there will be inspiration for those who must now once more show a similar zeal and ability to produce a form of missionary educational policy adapted to the changed needs of India, and which like his, shall have as its one aim the presentation of Christ and His Message to all who come within its influence.

Christ our Redemption.

By the Most Reverend John A. F. Gregg, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.

'Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.'—1 Co 1[30].

One of the greatest titles we are taught to apply to our Lord is that of Redeemer. And yet I doubt if, as a title, it conveys any particular notion to our minds; and if it does it is very likely to be a notion which has in it less, or more, than the truth. The proper meaning of the Greek Testament word[1] λυτροῦσθαι is to 'liberate'—to liberate at a cost, if you will, but, primarily and fundamentally, to liberate without necessary reference to cost or manner of liberation. The Latinized word 'redemption,' which a Sunday-school child will tell you means 'buying back,' is a mistranslation, if it is allowed to impose on our mind notions of bargaining, or purchase, or price, or concrete payment. Redemption is not so much a transaction carried out, as an effect produced. And thus Christ as Redeemer is Christ the Liberator, the Deliverer—loosing us or saving us from our sins, delivering us from the present evil world, redeeming us from all iniquity. The fundamental idea is of liberation, and must not be complicated with, or spoilt by, transactional notions which belong to the market but have no place in the spiritual world.

How can we venture to say this? The answer is, 'We are dealing with the liberation of human souls.' Whatever Christ does therefore has a spiritual character. Whatever He does, He does in relation to the souls of men. Redemption from sin means liberation from sinning, and that is a strictly spiritual thing. What is a sin? and how in practical reality can you liberate a man from sinning? It does not mean undoing the past, because redemption does not undo the past. A man's sinful deeds can no more be undone than the repentance of the world can undo the Cross. The past stands. It is indelible. Evil deeds done are facts, and facts are stubborn as adamant. How then can we be liberated from our sins?

Acts in themselves are physical things, and they

[1] See Lk 24[21], Tit 2[14], 1 P 1[18]; cf. Ps 118[133], and Ac 7[35] (λυτρωτής).

only acquire a moral character from the conscience of those concerned. A wound inflicted by one man upon another is a physical thing; we need to look behind it to see if it has any moral character at all. It was an accident, or it was inflicted in self-defence, or as an act of justice, or with malicious purpose. Its moral character depends upon its purpose. Now nothing can undo the wounding as a physical fact; whether inflicted accidentally or on purpose, it abides as an historical fact; whether repented of, or not needing to be repented of, its physical character stands, and even if healed the scar testifies to the physical occurrence.

But there is a thing that can be undone, and that is the moral attitude represented by the malice which chose (if so it did) to inflict a wound. That malice can live on quite apart from the deed in the consciousness of the doer; and it is there—in the conscience, or the consciousness, of the doer—that the sin is found. *There* is sin, and *there* is sin's penalty. Sin is less a thing than the attitude, the disposition, of a person. 'Sin' is really an abstraction—the solid reality is a person sinning. Of course, you get the man's discreditable acts; but as they pass into history, they lose their personal relations, and become merged in the common framework of men's lives. But his self, with the evil tendency, abides with him. And here is the problem that calls for redemption, or liberation, viz. not the question of how to put men's evil deeds right, but how to put right the sinful selves of men, in whom lie tendencies to sinful acts yielded to, and installed as masters, whether above or below the level of consciousness. Selves are the only things which can be redeemed or liberated from sin; and it is in respect of these that Christ stands before us as Redeemer or Liberator. Not merely does He give redemption, but (as St. Paul says) He is made unto us from God wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption. He *is* our Redemption. Redemption of persons is found in a Person. He needed to do certain acts and pass through certain experiences—to live, suffer, die, rise—as He qualified Himself to serve as Redeemer. But ultimately the Redemption is Himself.

Now what does it mean to redeem, or liberate, men from sinning? We do not want a literary theory, or a legalistic theory which can be stated in logical terms on paper, but which is at the end what it was at the beginning, paper and ink. We want facts, we want realities—something that actually operates, and operates spiritually to liberate men.

Well, then, to liberate men from sin is to modify their sinful selves in such a way that the tendency of the self ceases to be towards evil, and is definitely directed towards good. It means the liberation of the self, conscience, consciousness, will, faculty, instinct, so that the man who was doing evil things ceases to be the man who can do those things. It is not a question of what the man is reckoned, it is of what he actually is, and (perhaps even more) is on the way to becoming. Liberation is a problem touching the very depths of personality—those abysmal depths of which we hear so much in modern experimental psychology. It is a vast, a titanic problem—to redeem, or liberate, not merely one human soul, but a world of human souls, and the succession of human souls which pass through the world as the generations follow one another, and to carry on that work to its completion in the world beyond the grave. It baffles the imagination, and yet this is the problem whose solution Christianity proclaims in Christ.

How are we to think of Christ as Redeemer? We must think of Him *objectively*, *i.e.* in His own solitary pre-eminence as the world's agent of redemption, and we must think of Him *subjectively*, in His redeeming activity within those who will receive Him.

I.

First, then, Jesus Christ is in Himself Redemption. When He took our flesh and moved on earth, there had come into the world something literally new. True, He wore our human form and was very Man—true, He thought through a human brain: and yet, for all His continuity with us, He was a new fact in human history. He constituted a break—a new departure. His unsinning consciousness was a thing the like of which had never been known. His undefiled experience was on a level never heretofore conceived, much less attained. He was master of His soul, with a moral force and certainty which placed Him in a category apart. He showed Himself an entirely free spirit. He attained His freedom not without tears or sweat or blood; but He carried His manhood through life with a victorious advance that never halted. No worry, no doubt, no rivalry or self-seeking, no moral guilt, no regret or bitter memories, or blunting of sensibility through sin, no waste of power through

misdirected instinct or division of mind. He is the palmary example of the single eye, the single heart. He knew the attraction of all that attracts us, but He subordinated flesh to spirit, self to His mission, time to eternity, and proved His spiritual sovereignty over the world.

The manifested existence of a moral consciousness of the kind that was in Christ, is in itself a Redemption of the world. The world is different for it. A new fact of such magnitude is not merely a revolution, it is a new birth of humanity. It lodges in the heart of the race a deposit that is permanent light and life to mankind. That such a Being who can say of Himself, 'No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him'—that such a Being who can claim to have dealt a death-blow to the forces of evil, and can say, 'I was watching Satan as lightning fallen from heaven,' that such a One should have stood on our earth, worn our flesh, shared our lot, and have been untainted by our sin—makes our world, our flesh, our lot different for ever after, different because illuminated with God's revealed purpose for it. The tide has been forcibly turned. Man can be —has been—undefeated. Here is freedom's charter.

And we are taught to say of the Great Figure who has achieved this end, that He is our Redemption. For He is not merely a character of ancient history. It is He—His personality and not merely His story—who is Redemption. He is not a memory. He is a living and acting fact in the world to-day. This is what is effected by the Resurrection followed by the coming of the Holy Ghost, viz. that the Christ of the spiritual experience recorded in the New Testament is a Figure central, and of our own times—that He not merely was but is—that this liberating Person is not recumbent in remote rest but standing in vigorous operation—a principle of constructive goodness, victorious, energizing, universal, contemporary.

There, in a few words, is the present-day fact of the living Christ, the Redeemer or Liberator of souls through the manifestation of His own entirely liberated life. The rationale of the Church's existence is to hold up this living Personality before the world—to familiarize it with the wonder that has been wrought out in our flesh and blood.

II.

But redemption has also its *subjective* aspect. Christ is the Redeemer of the race at large—but each man must consent to undergo redemption. The redemption of a soul is a process that needs to work itself out in the soul that is to be redeemed. It is not a thing that can be done by proxy, or in its absence. By the will of God we must be co-agents with the Redeemer in the work of our redemption. Redemption is the work of the Redeeming Person in persons and with persons; and it is the reproduction of the life of the Redeemer in the redeemed.

Redemption operates from within outwards. It is Christ working within us—Christ seating Himself on the throne of our being, at the very centre of personality.

This distribution of the personal activity of Christ among so many millions of souls seems to us at first unreal. What am I to Christ? we ask, or (at least) we think; is the very Christ of Calvary and the Empty Tomb to hold commerce with me to-day?

But to ask this question and answer 'No' to it is equivalent to saying 'I disbelieve in the Holy Ghost.' The Holy Ghost is the agent of that spiritual actualizing of the One Christ in the hearts of many, irrespective of time and place, which makes Christianity a thing not in word but in power. A radical redemption without the Redeeming Person is a thing that does not happen. I cannot redeem myself, except superficially. The man on the operating table cannot be his own surgeon, he must lie in the hands of another.

However much we may dislike the phrase, 'original sin' represents an intractable fact of human experience. Man needs a deliverer, and he must look beyond himself. And in Christ he finds this 'beyond' that is within—not himself in any guise or disguise, but another—and yet another so intimately near that he can say, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' And this vital, healing Personality, blending Himself with ours, is life and health to it, and imparts Himself to it and attracts us into His likeness. He, in fact, in His deep activities, does what friendship, in its relatively superficial operations, does. Through fellowship He touches the springs of motive in that 'hinterland' below or behind consciousness which is so unrealized and yet so potent in its domination over our feelings and moods. He takes His place there and reorganizes the man from within.

This is no mere self-suggestion, no mere appeal to a man's own *vis medicatrix*. Man co-operates with an objective Redeemer, and man's redemption

keeps strict step with the growth of his fellowship with his Redeemer. And its fruits are seen and known in a liberated consciousness—the man becomes right minded; and as a man thinks, so is his freedom. He exhibits more and more of the mind of Christ. Into the content of that mind I cannot now enter. Suffice it to say that if it is to take form, there must be study of the New Testament, there must be determined prayer, there must be life as a member of the Christian society. Where these things are, liberation of mind declares itself in the man of the spirit. Such a one is putting fear under his feet—he has taken the measure of the terror of having his body killed or his possessions seized. He refuses anxiety or worry—he has dethroned greed—he is learning to love his neighbour; he feels a responsibility for making right prevail: that whole class of vexations which wait on self-assertion leaves undisturbed the man whose life is in Christ. There is no need to go through the lists of things avoided and things sought. Redemption of life Christianizes the mind—where a man lives in Christ there are love, joy, peace, faith, and power. The good tree brings forth good fruit.

Let us make no mistake about the Christian redemption. It is not merely a high type of self-regarding moral culture. Christ is not a mere teacher of liberating notions—notions quite independent of Himself. He is the Redemption. A great deal, of course, can be done by those who follow Christ's teaching and hold it without any thought of Christ. They can repent of their sins and turn over a new leaf, as it is called. But the extent of such a redemption is strictly limited—it is limited by their own capacities or incapacities. But where faith reaches out and brings in Christ, the Redeeming Person, there redemption is without limit. Self-dependence gives way to reliance on Him in whom is Life and Healing and Light. Of His fulness we receive, in Him we look back to a new lineage and forward to a new expansion, no longer sons of Adam but sons of God. The measure of redemption is not our finiteness, but God's infinity.

It is this reaching out to a Person—the beyond who is yet within—that saves the Christian redemption from being a pursuit of selfish personal gain. Love for Christ makes self-centredness a breach of trust. It pledges the redeemed to extend redemption beyond him. Love diverts attention from self. Love for Christ is no æsthetic sentimentalism. It is only real when Christ is loved in His suffering brethren. The love that thus serves, grows self-forgettingly into Christ's likeness. The supreme redemption is the redemption from self, redemption into love and service. We are only truly redeemed, as we mediate redemption; we are only forgiven, as we forgive. And the one sufficient motive for this is Christ. He knits mankind into a unity, and bids those whom He has redeemed focus His redemption upon the points of human life they touch. Redemption makes of them operative forces, comparable to light or leaven. Those who grow like Christ do this priestlike work; those who do this work grow like Him.

We need not ask ourselves whether a redemption of this world-order as we know it is divinely intended. We do not possess the data for such speculations. The New Testament blends restoration and catastrophe, optimism and pessimism, in a surprising way: optimism in respect of the Kingdom of God, pessimism in respect of what we call 'the world.' But such uncertainty as to remote issues offers no excuse for idleness in regard to present duties. Christ's method is the only practical one; to do right now is the only constructive course. He became man at a given point of time, and by serving His own time with whole-hearted devotion He served all time. And it is the same for ourselves. Whether sooner or later, there will be deliverance for the sons of God, and to the hastening of this glorious liberty every son must contribute in hope. Those who are becoming free must set others free; the redeemed must mediate redemption. It is in this way, viz. as we serve God and men in Christ's name here and now—it is in this way that we experience and we extend the redemption, the liberation, that is Christ.

The Place of Systematic Theology in Preaching.

By the Reverend Daniel Lamont, B.D., Helensburgh.

There are those who would place a mark of interrogation after the above title, or even a mark of exclamation. Many influences coming from previous generations have combined to form a common notion that doctrine is irrelevant to the Christian Life and that, *a fortiori*, it is irrelevant to Christian Preaching. The best way to meet that notion is to say that it is not true. It is a truism that life is more than doctrine, but it is a fallacy to argue that therefore doctrine has no place in life. Doctrine has a paramount place in the Christian life, and the question is one, not between doctrine and no doctrine, but between good doctrine and bad. Christ is the Life, but no less is He the Truth, and the remembrance of this warns us against any false separation of the two. The Holy Spirit, in ministering Christ to us, ministers the Truth. Doctrine means *teaching*, and the charter of Christian doctrine is in God, the One who is True.

More worthy of attention are those who hold that Systematic Theology, while having a place of its own in the life of the Church, should be kept severely in the background in preaching. *Ars celare artem.* Theology, it is said, is a discipline whose value for preaching lies in providing a man's words with atmosphere and system. Its energy, but none of its mechanism, should pass into the sermon. All this is entirely in point as against a barren intellectualism, but not as against the vital declaration of Christian Truth. Nobody need deny that the mechanism of theology must be strictly eliminated from preaching, but theology is more than mechanism. It is not a purely formal science like grammar or logic. It has a content which is at least as real and objective as that of any other science, and that content, in its whole magnitude, is the theme of Christian Preaching. If theology were no more than mechanism, it would have little energy to impart to preaching or to anything else. The requisite energy presupposes a knowledge of Christian Truth.

With the qualifications implied in what has been already said, Systematic Theology has a vital place in Christian Preaching. This is far from saying that no one can preach Christ who has not undergone a theological discipline. As in the early Church there was an order of evangelists as well as an order of teachers, so has the evangelist a secure place in the Church of to-day. There are evangelists who are richly honoured of God in leading souls out into the Light, and who cannot be suspected of complicity with theological books or colleges. More power to them! But this does not touch the point at issue. People need not only to be led into the Light, but to keep walking in the Light. The Church has suffered from many false assumptions, and from none more than this, that when once a man has given his heart to Christ his inward spiritual task has been completed. Life only begins for him at that turning-point, and since life and growth cannot be dissociated he must grow. The process of becoming a full-grown Christian man implies a growth into the truth, as truth is in Jesus.

Healthy growth in the Christian life presupposes growth in Christian Knowledge. That fact provides the basal justification of doctrinal preaching. There are many considerations which endorse this general position, and a few of these may be indicated here.

I.

History proves that the Christian Religion suffers whenever there is any diminution of intellectual interest in it. It may be replied that this is putting the cart before the horse, and that more to the point is the converse proposition that decline in intellectual interest is one effect of a general fall in the tide of life. There is no need to deny the converse, but it is written large in history that the high tide cannot long be sustained when the mind has ceased to be eager and alert. This is true even of the individual, but more manifestly true of the larger and longer life of a society. The quick decay of power in pietistic movements, and the efforts made by some of the wisest mystics to give their experience a foothold in the kingdom of the mind, bear testimony to the imperious demand that Christians must give sustained and systematic thought to the contents of their faith.

II.

Expository preaching misses fire when it is not articulated in a scheme of systematic instruction. The reason is that in that case it is not true exposition. When one proposes to exhibit some facet of Christian truth to a congregation he must, either there and then, or at some time, make the setting of his subject clear to his listeners. He must make it his ambition 'to declare the whole counsel of God.' Alike in dealing with historical and with ethical magnitudes he must somehow make the people feel the full force of the gospel. St. Paul could not even intimate a collection without linking it up with the mightiest motives in the universe. If it is said that our Lord, and not St. Paul, is the Great Teacher, we agree, for the parables of our Lord give the very best confirmation of the point which we are now trying to make. In each parable He fills the soul with one definite truth, but He obviously requires us to give like heed to 'all the parables.' Besides, in any one parable, how wonderful is the co-ordination of His specific theme with the whole magnitude of His message! Even when He is commenting on the human folly of rejecting the Kingdom, the abounding generosity of the King shines through all His words. Thus the Parable of the Great Supper is rightly included among the Parables of Grace. While its 'didactic drift' is to show how men in the mass allow their own preoccupations to blunt their minds to the urgency of the Great Invitation, the background rings all the while with the Glad Tidings. Nowhere is Systematic Theology more in demand than in the exposition of the words of our Lord.

III.

The disadvantages of specialism are more pronounced in Theology than in any other science. This arises from the nature of its contents and need not be argued. The gap between the trained theologian and the average Church member is much too wide and entails a serious loss for both [bu]One need not be very old to remember a time when the gap was not so wide. The writer can recall the earnestness and keenness of mind with which his grandmother used to discuss the doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans, and he then felt instinctively that her interest in such high and deep themes was in organic relation to the strength and beauty of her character. An age which is excessively addicted to novelties may smile over those old amateur theologians, but were the old folk to return and look into the religious minds of their successors, their faces would wear an aspect more becoming than a smile. Earnest people are everywhere deploring the modern ignorance and neglect of the Bible, but it is still too little recognized that one principal cause of the fatality lies in the modern preacher's abandonment of doctrinal preaching. If the Bible's appeal to the mind is not heard from our pulpits, how can we expect the race to maintain its interest in the Word of Truth?

IV.

Uncertainty and confusion abound with regard to the very core of the Christian Faith. They abound in the minds of Church members, and if this is so with the green tree, what of the dry? We lose many potential Church workers, and the work of many of those who remain faithful is paralysed, through this grave uncertainty. It may be boldly affirmed that many of our best Church members, who matter most for Christian leadership, are longing for clear teaching from our pulpits on the fundamentals of the Faith. They believe, and rightly, that if they are to prepare themselves for battle they ought to hear a trumpet which gives forth no uncertain sound. Discourses on sociology and psychology, literature, art, the world-situation and the like, do not meet the Church's deepest need. Discourses which keep moral questions dangling in the air are of little or no use to anybody. The primary need of the Church at this moment is a clear, convincing, passionate declaration of that which lies at the foundation of all Christian life. There are many who are coming and saying: 'Sir, we would see Jesus,' and no preacher can comply with that request without making his appeal to all the mind there is to appeal to. There is no Christian experience which is not penetrated with doctrine, and if we have to deplore a meagre experience to-day, something at least of the blame lies at the door of those who are set to declare the whole truth of the gospel and who spend their strength upon its fringes. And if we are not fit to use plainness of speech where such plainness is indispensable, we should consider the question of our vocation.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

What taking Pains can do.[1]

'Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.'—2 Co 5^{17}.

You all know what an elephant is like, don't you? Perhaps you have seen one: anyway, you have heaps of pictures of them in your school books or in some Eastern tales, with men perched up on top of them, shooting at tigers that are leaping at them with a snarl. An elephant is a huge beast—oh yes, much taller than daddy—with legs as thick as pillars, and a wise brain almost as clever as a man's, and a trunk so sensitive that it can pick up a needle from the ground with it, and yet so strong that it can pull down a tree with it. It could snatch you up and swing you to its back, and think nothing about it. But an elephant wasn't always like that, so wise men say: at first it was quite different. All things, of course, when they are young are not a bit like what they are when they grow up. There is mother, for example. Perhaps you have a photograph of her when she was small, and you can't stop laughing every time you see it. She's quite wee, and how funny she looks, with a long pigtail hanging down her back, and such prim bows in her hair, and such queer clothes! You wouldn't have known that it is mother, yet it is. But I don't mean only that, but that at first even a grown-up elephant wasn't one bit like what grown-up elephants are now. They were quite small, just about the size of some kinds of donkeys, so a great professor man who knows about these things says, and its legs were quite thin, and its brain wasn't very clever, and as for its trunk, it had no trunk, only its nose, and it was quite a short and rather snubby one. So, you see, it has changed altogether, has become another kind of creature. Well, that's good news for some of us, isn't it? For we are pretty tired of ourselves, and don't want to go on being what we are. We would like to be different, quite different, not horrid and ratty, and all arms and feet, and temper and passion, but good-humoured enough to take knocks without flying into a rage over it; not apt to keep things to ourselves, but generous little beggars who of course go halves, and would hate not to share. You don't like being cross and mean, and you try not to be it; yet that, perhaps, is what you are, and there it is. A toad mayn't like being a toad, may think it would be fine to be a lion, yet a toad is what it is; 'And I,' you say, 'am a bad-tempered, horrid little beast, and I can't help it!' Oh, but you can! We can become new creatures, altogether different from what we are. Here is a wise creature that did it, so, you see, there can be no mistake. So, as I tell you, that's good news. But how are we to manage? How did the elephant? Just by taking pains. And it took lots of pains, millions of years of it, for all I know. Anyway it was a long, slow, plucky business. Yet it stuck it out, and in the end it managed it. At first, and for a long, long time indeed, it didn't seem much use. You and I would have said that it would never come to anything, quite a small creature there among huge brutes that could swallow it up, and none too clever at the start. But it said, 'I'm not over-smart, nor extra strong, nor big, but I can try, can keep on taking pains'; and, doing that, it made itself into the great wise animal that it is now. Well, you and I could take pains too. And there's no end to what that could do for us. There was once a man in Parliament who got up to make his first speech, and did so badly that everybody laughed at him, and he had to sit down; but, said he, 'You will listen to me some day.' And they did, because he became one of the two best speakers in the place. Just because he took pains. There is a man whose name everybody knows to-day, who, when he was a boy, had a most dreadful stutter, so that his folk said, 'Whatever will we do with him?' 'I'm going to be a speaker like my father,' the boy said; and he took pains and tried, and tried, and kept on trying, till his stammer was quite conquered, and now he is one of the finest speakers in the world. All because he took pains. Or, you know Stevenson's *Treasure Island*? What? You don't! Oh, but that's not fair! Tell daddy that I said so; or better, isn't your birthday coming near? Then, there's your chance to get a splendid story all about the sea and ships and pirates, and a wonderful island and the treasure hidden on it. Well, Stevenson when he was at

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

school, yes, and long after it, couldn't write much, and couldn't spell at all; but he stuck in, and tried and tried, and kept on trying, and in the end he wrote some of the most glorious of stories. All because, like the elephant, he took pains. And what about you? Perhaps at school you are rather slow, can't take in that new kind of sum about pipes running in, and others running out; or you are getting all tied up over the Greek verb, it's the passive that is doing it, I'll be bound, those horrid aorist imperatives and things; or it's analysis that gets you every time, or in Latin you never can remember about time how long, or, in or at a town; anyway you're not over-quick, and sometimes the master loses patience, and says you're a perfect donkey. Well, the next time that happens say to yourself (but mind you be very, very careful, you can hardly be too careful, to say it low, under your breath, or you'll get into trouble; and, if you forget and speak too loud and catch it, don't blame me, because I told you), say to yourself under your breath, 'I may be like a donkey now, but wait you until I'm finished and I'll show you; the elephant was as small as a donkey once, and yet look at it now!'

And so with other things, with that old temper, with your grumpiness; stick in, take pains, keep trying, and you'd wonder what you'll manage in the end. Take pains, but at what? Why, at using what you have, of course. Look what the elephant did! It started with ordinary teeth, and it made for itself in time those huge ivory tusks that are feet long, and sometimes weigh 75 lb. It started with an ordinary kind of nose, and it made out of that its wonderful trunk, with which it can do almost anything. The first men thought they could make something out of their clumsy forefeet, and now we have the hand, that marvellous thing so clever in a thousand ways, that writes, that makes music, that builds, that does for us almost everything. The bird set out upon another line, and it has got its wonderful wings, can dip and soar far, far more cleverly than any airman can. But the elephant believed in its nose! At first it was quite dumpy; 'But wait you,' said the elephant, and it has really made its marvellous trunk. Kipling, of course, tells us in *Just So Stories*—(What! you don't know them either! Well, that would be a good idea to suggest to mother for your birthday). Kipling says that it was a crocodile in the Limpopo River that got hold of the nose of a young baby elephant, and pulled it so hard that wee Mr. Elephant cried out, "Led go!", talking like you with a cold, for you see its nose was being held quite hard, 'Led go, you are hurtig me!' It was that pull that made it long, says Kipling. But that's not true. At least you don't need to believe it all, unless you like. It was by taking pains it did it, for itself. And you haven't got much brains! well, use the little you have and it will grow. And you're not a bit unselfish! then be unselfish when you can, in this little thing, and then in that, and it will become easier and easier and easier. The elephant had only a snub nose once, but it made a clever trunk of it. And when the Lord Christ looks at you, though He sees only a rowdy tempery cross little chap, 'I can make a real big strong man out of this,' He says; 'I am sure of it, if only I can get him to take pains and try.'

What is it?[1]

'But Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.'—Lk 2^{19}.

Some ten years ago a great chemist was at work in London. He was busy that day with a kind of sand that had been sent to him all the way from New Zealand to examine. And suddenly he came on something he had never seen before. There it was, and yet he, with all his knowledge, didn't know it, couldn't think what it could be: he looked up his books, and there was none of them that had a word about anything at all like this. It was a new thing. But what was it? And what could it do? He didn't know. 'But I'll find out,' he said; and he put it carefully away grain by grain in a glass tube, and sealed it up. But just then the War came; and he got dreadfully busy, had to think about a hundred things and all of them at once. And so he forgot all about the glass tube, and there it lay on some dusty shelf, perhaps, for eight whole years.

But some time ago two wise men in Denmark came on the track of a wonderful thing. They saw clear traces of it, though they had never seen it by itself, but always mixed with something else. But they became quite sure that if they could find it alone, they would have discovered a new element; that is, you know, one of the things out of which the world and things in it are built up, as music is made out of notes, or as jam is just fruit and sugar and water, and some stones, perhaps. 'We have found a new element,' they said, 'that has always been in

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

the world, but nobody has seen it yet.' And with that the chemist in London began to think; but what was that I had in that glass tube of mine so many years ago? And the more he thought, the more he wondered; and at last he set to work and had a look for it and found it, and there it was, a new element. 'What is this in this tube, I wonder?' he had said, looking at it eagerly: and after all these years he found out what it was.

But mother and dad have had something at home in your house just about as long: ten, eleven, twelve years, isn't it? Something that is quite new, and often they look at it, and ask themselves, 'I wonder what kind of a thing this is going to be? Will it be good or bad? Will it do harm or will it help? Is it like dynamite that blows things to bits, or like chloroform that makes things easier and better? I wonder what it really is?' they ask. Well, they will soon know now. For the thing is you: and you are getting on, and growing up. They have waited years and years, but they will soon see now what kind of man or woman you are going to be.

There was once a woman who had a baby. She lived in a little Highland village called Nazareth; and sometimes, as women will, she would take her baby on her lap, and hold its small pink feet, as it lay there gooing and crumpling up its fists as babies do, and she would ask herself, 'I wonder where these little feet will carry my wee son.' Well, we all know now. For they took Him up the hill at Calvary to die for you and me. All that was in that little fellow lying there. And there was a day when Mary was tremendously proud. She had been teaching her baby boy to speak. The first word that mothers teach us here is 'DADA': it is so easy to say. And over yonder in that land they used to teach first 'ABBA'—which just means dada—for it, too, is a very easy word. And one day, when Joseph came in hot and tired from the workshop, the wee man said 'ABBA,' and Joseph's face lit up with pleasure, and Mary was real proud because her baby had begun to talk. And now He has taught all the world to go to God and say to Him too, 'Abba, Father.' 'What will become of this baby of mine?' so Mary used to wonder. And now we know.

But at that very time over in the little town of Kerioth there was another mother who had a baby: and she too was very proud of him, and she too would sit looking at him, wondering what he would grow to be. And he was Judas, that wee man, Judas who betrayed his Lord and did the deed of shame. All that was in that little one.

'What's in this tube,' the chemist said, holding it up and looking at it; 'something new and something wonderful, but what?' And sometimes, when you are asleep, mother and father look at you, and think and pray and ask, 'What will become of them when they grow up?' And often when you are cross and grumpy and grabby they grow unhappy and afraid: and then again when you are unselfish and good-humoured and straight they grow cheery again. Of course they will do their best to help you, but they can't manage for you. They will try to give you a good start, but you must do the rest yourself. You know about the Gulf Stream, don't you? Well, wise men have been trying to discover where exactly it goes. They throw bottles into it, each of them with a message that, if they are found, they are to be sent back telling just where they were picked up. Lots of them get lost, of course. But three of them were returned lately. One came from the Azores, away down in the sunshine and the blue seas yonder: another was found at the Orkneys drifting about in the grey waters there: and one came back from the North Cape away up near the Arctic, with the ice freezing it in. At the beginning they all started off together, and yet by and by they drifted from each other, further and further and still further, till all these long miles lay between them, and they had reached places so very different. And boys and girls brought up together can have very, very different kinds of lives. In the New Testament we hear of two bairns who had the same nurse and played together every day: and often that woman looking at her boys romping and tumbling over one another would say to herself, 'What will they grow to be, these two?' Well, one of them became Herod, haughty and proud and cruel, while the other was Manaen who gave himself to Jesus Christ and put his life to big unselfish uses. 'What's in this tube?' said the chemist; 'something new, but what? What will it do and be, evil or good, a help or a nuisance?'

It is for you to say. For you are not a bottle that must go bobbing along where the waves and the winds and the currents send it. You have a will with which to choose, and feet to set down firmly and stand up on. And you can say, 'I can't, perhaps, be clever, for I wasn't made like that; and I mayn't, perhaps, grow rich, nor does that greatly matter: but one thing I can be and will:

I can be clean and true, and unselfish and straight.' Ah! if that is what is in the tube, then what a splendid thing it is that is in the world, for you will help us and make things far better! And that, no doubt of it, is what God meant that you should do.

The Christian Year.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

The Christ of the Past.

'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday.'—Heb 13^8.

The old world is ever changing. The sun will burn itself out, and the stars will all disappear. 'They all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.' In the midst of all this waste and wear and change Jesus lives ever the same—lived yesterday, lives now, and hears every sob of every child of His; shall live to wipe the last tear, to ease the pillow under the last aching head, to triumph over the last grave that shall be dug; for 'he is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' Our business is to try to find out what Jesus Christ was yesterday, the day He lived among men, what He was and did, and that may comfort us to-day.

What was Christ yesterday? We have but little difficulty in finding out. We have four pictures of Him, made at different times, by various hands. These pictures are the four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles may be called a fifth, for it shows us the gospel in action. Let us glance at these pictures; they are instructive, and together they may furnish us what we want to know on the subject in hand. They represent Him in His working garb. They show Him in His glorified robes on the Mount of Transfiguration, and they let us see Him in His risen majesty. From the Gospels we learn three facts.

In the first place, He was a Revealer; in the second place, He was a Saviour; and in the third place, He was a Master.

1. He was a *Revealer*.

(1) He revealed men primarily to themselves. When He said to Peter one day, 'Thou art a rock,' Peter was far from being a rock. Impetuous, headstrong, always itching to say something and do something, never being able to keep out or keep still, rushing in where angels fear to tread—that was Peter. Yet our Lord turned to him, and said, 'Thou art a rock.' The Lord revealed the truth of the man.

There was that woman at the well in Samaria where our Lord stayed to rest Himself. After her conversation with Him she went back to the village, and said to her friends, 'Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did!' He brought the truth out.

There was Nicodemus, the ruler, the member of Congress of his day, who came to Jesus in the night, to ask Him about life. The Lord revealed his need of a new birth.

And there was Zacchæus, the little man to whom no one paid very much attention. He climbed up into a tree to see Christ. Why? Because there was something about our Lord that revealed men to themselves and brought them to the truth.

(2) Then He was a Revealer of God to men. Men had had peculiar notions about God. Every tribe, every country, every group of people had a god, more than one god. They had a god of the storm, a god of the rain, a god of the sun and of the moon, a god of the ocean, a god of strength and of illness, many, many gods of disease—peculiar ideas of God! Even in our Old Testament we find the record of how the God of the Hebrews differed from the gods of other tribes. But when Jesus came He taught men how to think about God, and He never said any of the things about Him that they had heard before. And—marvel of marvels!—our Lord taught the people by showing them pictures and telling them stories. The picture of the prodigal son, do you know why that is in the Bible? It is not so much to tell us about the son as it is to give us a picture of the father, rushing out of the house and down the road to welcome home the boy who had gone away.

And what do we find that He said about God? Well, He certainly reveals Him as a God who is interested in and cares for us. That was very new in men's thoughts about God; Someone who was interested and cared so much that He gave all that was dearest to Him for us. It was a wonderful picture of God, a God who suffered because He loved so much. Have you ever loved someone so dearly that you have suffered, that your heart ached because of your love? That is what Christ taught us about God.

2. Not only was He a Revealer, He was a *Saviour*.

He saved men from themselves. What is the worst enemy of life? It is not something outside. It would be rather comforting if we could feel there was someone we could blame for our ill-temper, wouldn't it? It would be rather comforting if we could always say, 'So-and-so got me all wrought up to-day.' Yes, but it is not true! That thing does not happen unless there is something in us that is permissive. Christ saves men from themselves.

How? He won them by this wonderful picture of love; and when they came into contact with this object of their love they realized that there was something between them and Him, something that kept them apart; there was a wedge thrust in, and that wedge is called Sin. Now Christ was a Saviour because He brought men and God together by getting rid of the wedge, removing the spot, taking out the blot, doing away with the blemish. He washed it all out, and brought the two together in understanding, sympathizing, co-operating love.

3. He gave men a *Master*. We all of us want to be controlled. You talk about freedom, you talk about liberty, you talk about wanting to do the thing that you want to do. It is not true; that is not what you want most. You want somebody by the very invested right of his nature to rule over you, because he can and must rule over you, throughout your life, and you are never happy until you find that master. Why, the war revealed it to us! The happiest people were the men and women who gave up their lives to service in the war. Have you ever known such waves of joy rolling over this country, in every little village and in every great city, because people were united in one great purpose and mastered by a controlling devotion to one great cause? Their lives were swept for the moment out of the littleness and the pettiness of their own selfish interests, and they gave themselves up to a cause. They were mastered by the ideal of the war. That showed the real nature of life.

Christ furnishes such mastery. He is the Master of men. Wherever He walked, whomsoever He touched, upon whom He even looked, He said, 'Come! Come with me'; and He said, 'Go! Go into all the world, and make learners of me.' Ah yes, what a Master He was, and they found it in Him by natural right![1]

[1] H. R. Weir.

WHITSUNDAY.

Dreams and Visions.

'Your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.'—Jl 2[28].

Dreams and visions. What are they the result of? They are the result of the spirit of God coming upon the world. That means a quickening of faculty, an enlargement of horizon, a broadening of hope, and the excitement of this great Divine visitation passes over young and old alike. It is the annexation of a new universe; it may be taken as a just and accurate description of the effect of a true religion upon a man's life. Religion does not narrow life, but broadens it into infinity. When a man opens his soul to the spirit of God, when he lives by faith and not by sight, when he is truly and deeply religious, he has entered into a heritage of spiritual vision, and lives a larger life because he has a wider horizon to gaze upon.

Youth is the period of visions. In the clear light of life's early days we see with piercing distinctness, because the faculty of the vision is fresh in us. What gives youth its power is that there is a noble inconsiderateness in its temper, which brings vision and action into closer relation than usually happens in later life. For youth, to see is to act, to believe is to affirm, to know is to do. The one key to a noble life is to see clearly, and then to act in absolute obedience to the highest vision. The visions of youth then become the dreams of age.

The measure of a man is the measure of his vision. Man is pre-eminently the creature who sees. Other creatures can look in stolid silence on the stars, but no other can watch them with intelligent curiosity and read their secret. What are the chief visions by which men live? They are four—the vision of the Mind, which is the vision of Progress; of the Moral Nature, which is the vision of Duty; of the Heart, which is the vision of Love; of the Soul, which is the vision of Faith. It is by these visions that men live. To keep these visions through youth and manhood is to live nobly, and for such as do this the visions of youth become the dreams of age, and life rounds itself off into noble music and Divine completion.

1. *The Vision of the Mind* which is the vision of Progress. It is plain that Joel, in writing these words, felt himself at the end of an era. He sums up the evils of his time; he discounts its glory; he foresees its retributions; and he says there is nigh

at hand 'a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, as the dawn spread upon the mountains.' We are familiar with this prophecy. The merest glance at history convinces us that time moves in cycles. There is a period of growth, followed by a time of splendour and then by a rapid decline.

Have we come to-day to such a period of decline? We have had our dreams and our visions, and now the visions are clouded, the dreams are bitter. Age and youth alike are disillusioned and cynical. The chapter headings of 'International Aspects of Unemployment'—reviewed this month—are typical of the problems of to-day and the way in which they are being faced. 'A Sick Civilization' is the title of one, sub-divided into (*a*) 'War's sequelæ,' (*b*) 'Uneconomic peace,' (*c*) 'Monetary flux,' and the title of the last chapter is 'Cerebral Decay.' Over all our minds is a paralysis of fear.

How are we to be redeemed from it? By the one supreme thought, that the spirit of God still moves among the nations. 'I will pour out my spirit on all flesh' is a promise not for one age alone, but for every age till the Divine Will is perfectly wrought in the making of man. Things happen from time to time that seem a retardation of progress; humanity, afraid of itself and its destinies, retreats when every lofty voice calls to it to advance; civilization itself seems often to move upon a circle, repeating old follies in new forms; but nevertheless the Eternal Spirit of Life and Progress works tireless through all.

2. *The Vision of Duty.* Is there one of us who has not felt promptings which we know are noble, and which lead to nobility of conduct? And the highest wisdom of life is to live by those visions. A life spent in the pursuit not of pleasures but of duties is evermore its own exceeding great reward. And not least among its rewards is this, that it leads to tranquil and satisfied old age. Men have regretted many things when they have come to the end of life; but no man ever yet regretted a duty bravely done.

It is in the days of youth that the vision of Duty is most clearly seen. It is then that the verdict of the moral nature is felt to be most authoritative. And is it not true also that youth is fruitful with moral dilemmas which can be solved only by strict obedience to the moral vision? How easy to prefer pleasure to duty! But woe to you if you yield, for it is death! Fight on in stubborn obedience to right, even when right seems the means by which a wrong is wrought on you, and you will overcome. Follow that vision of Duty, for be assured it is Divine, and

> He that ever following her commands,
> On, with toil of heart and knees and hands,
> Thro' the long gorge to the far light has won
> His path upward and prevailed,
> Shall find the toppling crags of duty scaled
> Are close upon the shining table-lands
> To which our God Himself is moon and sun.

3. Take, again, *the Vision of the Heart*, the dream of the reality of pure and noble love in the world. Cherish the dream, for there is none that fades so easily. It is one of the commonest temptations of youth to discount this vision with a cheap and shallow cynicism. But there are old men who have gone to the grave dreaming of this love. It has kept its radiance to the last, and its fine gold has not become dim, nor its freshness faded. But these men were the men who in youth saw the vision, and followed it; and that was why in age they dreamed dreams still and saw a Paradise

> Where love once leal has never ceased,
> And dear eyes never lose their shine;
> And there shall be a marriage feast
> Where Christ shall once more make the wine.

4. Highest of all is the fourth vision, *the Vision of the Soul*, which is the vision of Faith. Faith in what? Faith in God, in Christ, in the spiritual world which lies around this little life. In the early dawn of life, when the vision of the soul is fresh, we see these invisible refuges of the soul as great realities. To the keen and unsophisticated sense of the child, God, and Christ, and the spiritual world are real and near. We hear, as Wordsworth heard, the murmur of the sea that brought us hither; we cry as Browning cried to that 'Pale Form,' so dimly seen, deep-eyed, the Christ, who moves our souls and calls for our obedient love. And there are many moments of acute vision, which by God's great mercy happen to us, when we gain heart-moving glimpses of Christ, when He steps out of some often read verse before us in the Divine charm of His love; when some hymn interprets and reveals Him for an instant, and our souls go out to Him. And there are hours in life too, when the reality of a

spiritual world is made almost visible to us; when at the grave we have exchanged beauty for ashes, when in prayer we have seemed to find an answering voice, when in silence we have felt the mystery of unseen presences, and our hearts have leapt up in the passion of conscious immortality. Oh, cherish these visions, follow those inherent intuitions of the soul. Faint as they are, they are true; and they will grow stronger as we follow them, and in the struggle of life they will be the masterlight of all our seeing, and in the eventide of life will shine like a benignant sunset on the path that slopes to rest.[1]

Trinity Sunday.

Wanted—Volunteers!

'Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me.'—Is 6^{8}.

1. As has often been pointed out, there is no Trinitarian reference in this text. We no longer understand the words 'Who will go for us' as part of a colloquy between the Persons of the Godhead. As the Bishop of Durham says, when Isaiah in his ecstasy 'heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?' we may be sure that he took from the words no other impression than that which would have been familiar to the men of his generation. The Jewish Scriptures not infrequently disclose the belief that Jehovah presided over a number of Divine beings other than Himself, with whom He took counsel, and through whom He acted. Thus the prophet Micah is said to have heard the Lord discuss with 'the host of heaven' the means by which Ahab should be 'enticed' to destruction; and the Book of Job opens with a scene in the heavenly court 'when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them.'[2]

But though there is no conscious Trinitarianism in this text it contains a fitting lesson for Trinity Sunday. For in it there is a great deal implied as to the Divine nature. We see that there is that in the Godhead which can appeal to the spirit of man and hold fellowship with him. The thick veil, which shrouds the enigma of existence, is for a moment lifted in the Temple, when God calls, and Isaiah answers His call; and that which we are permitted to see points to a still greater apocalypse of Godhead, when the response to the Divine vocation shall be rendered, not by one whose way must lie through repentance and purgation to a partial vision and a temporary witness, but freely, fully, and finally by Him who was at the same time God and man.

2. Our text then brings God and men together. For it shows two things—first that God has need of men and calls them, and second that they themselves must respond to the call. He will have volunteers, not forced labour.

(1) '*Whom shall I send?*' Here is the Almighty waiting for a human instrument. The mere statement of such a possibility touches the soul with awe. The Father of our spirits has imposed upon Himself a limitation which makes Him dependent upon His children. There is Divine work which tarries until the appointed soul arrives.

God has never done any great thing in human history until He has found some man big enough to handle the job. Earth's chosen heroes have always been men who have stood alone. Count them o'er, and they tower like tall trees above the forest of humanity: Noah, Abram, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Isaiah; events paused till they appeared, each to do the work for which he was called. The salvation of the Gentiles waited for Paul. The Reformation waited for Luther. The English revival waited for Wesley. The Salvation Army waited for Booth. Nationalism waited for Lincoln, and every great cause waits till some man answers the call.

There is a significant thing about this call that Isaiah heard. It was not specific; his name was not mentioned. No great imperative spoke out of the smoke, and said, 'Here, Isaiah, you go.' It was the general, eternal call that he heard. Many people still wait for the lightning flash, the thunderbolt.

(2) '*Send me.*' The call was one for volunteers. It was not conscription. And Isaiah volunteered. 'Then I said, Here am I; send me.'

> *Wanted Volunteers*
> *To do their best for twoscore years!*
> A ready soldier, here I stand,
> Primed for thy command
> With burnished sword.
> If this be faith, O Lord
> Help Thou mine unbelief
> And be my battle brief.[3]

It is the volunteers who count; the great achieve-

[1] W. J. Dawson, *The Reproach of Christ*, 242.
[2] H. H. Henson, *The Creed in the Pulpit*, 268.
[3] Robert Louis Stevenson.

ments of humanity have always been the work of volunteers, they have been the expression of men's innermost natures. No really great thing has ever been achieved in response to material incentives.

We read that the night when Wilberforce first denounced West Indian slavery in Parliament, he left the House of Commons an outcast and a pariah, with all the great country houses closed against him. We know that when Henry Ward Beecher identified himself with the same cause of negro emancipation, he became one of the best-hated men in the country, risking violence and worse. Men cannot be coerced into such action, or encouraged to make such stands, by offers of gold or promotion; they come forward voluntarily or not at all, in free obedience to an inner, higher law. It was the same with the men, so diversely gifted, Mazzini and Garibaldi, who made a free and United Italy possible. There was not a trace of self-seeking in their activities, they did not weigh their sufferings against the possibilities of personal advancement—you can't create liberators and heroes by an appeal to their egoism; they would have died a hundred times over to realize their dream of their nation's unity and independence.

Think of the romance of missions—Morrison undertaking single-handed to carry the gospel into China, Judson preaching the Cross in Burmah, William Carey setting out upon the conquest of India, Livingstone devoting his life to the Dark Continent, and so on to this day. We recognize the spirit in which they went forth—the same spirit that filled Paul with fiery and unresting energy, that seized hold of those great Irish missionaries in the sixth and seventh centuries, and impelled them to evangelize the wild regions of Central Europe.[1] It is not the spirit of those who work for pay, but the spirit of volunteers.

'Then I said, Here am I.' Isaiah not only volunteered, but he volunteered without delay. And so it is that we men and women are to be standing at attention, waiting to receive our commissions. We are to have our loins girt and our lamps burning. We are to be 'shod with the readiness of the gospel of peace.' For we never know when some purpose of the Lord is ripening, when a human instrument will be wanted and a new commission given. 'At such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh.' And therefore it is our wisdom to be always ready, listening for the ennobling summons of the Lord. 'How soon can you be ready for the Soudan?' Gordon was asked. 'I am ready now,' he answered.

And what are our commissions likely to be? For the vast majority of us they are likely to be quite ordinary errands. The essential things in human life are spiritual vitalities, and these are carried in the simplest ministries. Apparently commonplace fidelities are laden with heaven's grace. The crying needs of the world are elemental, and they are to be met by the elemental satisfaction of faith, and hope, and love. To be the minister of these graces is to be the fellow-labourer of God.

The Lord wants reapers: oh, mount up,
Before night comes, and says, 'Too late!'
Stay not for taking scrip or cup,
The Master hungers while ye wait;
'Tis from these heights alone your eyes
The advancing spears of day can see,
That o'er the eastern hill tops rise,
To break your long captivity.[2]

First Sunday after Trinity.

The Silent Years.

'Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature' (R.V.m. 'age').—Lk 2^{52}.

Of the many years spent in Nazareth, during which Jesus passed from infancy to childhood, from childhood to youth, and from youth to manhood, the Evangelic narrative has left us but the briefest notice. Of His childhood; that He 'grew and waxed strong in spirit filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him'; of His youth, besides the account of His questioning the Rabbis in the Temple the year before He attained Jewish majority—that He 'was subject to his parents,' and that He 'increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.' Considering what loving care watched over Jewish child-life, tenderly marking by not fewer than eight designations the various stages of its development, and the deep interest naturally attaching to the early life of the Messiah, that silence, in contrast with the absurdities of the Apocryphal Gospels, teaches us once more, and most impressively, that the Gospels furnish a history of the Saviour, not a biography of Jesus of Nazareth.

On His return to Nazareth from Jerusalem as a 'Son of the Law,' a recognized member of the com-

[1] J. Warschauer, *Challenge and Cheer*, 65.

[2] James Russell Lowell.

munity able to take His place with the adults in the synagogue service, a curtain immediately descends on His life. Until He emerges from the seclusion of the village to enter on His great work eighteen years after, nothing more is known about Him beyond the simple and natural statement of St. Luke, that He 'increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.' The years from twelve to thirty represent a period of priceless value in the life of a man. During that time the soul awakens into life, the mind develops,[1] opinions are formed, and convictions established. Whatever these mean to him they settle his future career, and probably his destiny. In the village of Nazareth life would be circumscribed by very narrow limits for an ordinary Jew. He would learn something of the world, mingle occasionally with its stream of profit, exchange the common gossip of the day with his neighbours, and visit his relations. His religious duties would keep him within the movements of the community, his business instincts take him to the adjacent towns, and his desire for pleasure to the Galilean lake. There is nothing in all these processes of human nature to account for the most perfect figure of all time, the One who stands immeasurably superior to all mankind.

Of these years we know three facts.

1. *They were years of obscurity.*—He lived within twenty miles of the busy scenes of the northern towns, near the trade routes of the caravans from the Eastern lands to the Western Sea, yet not a single word in the Gospels explains how the silent years in Nazareth were spent; nothing is said by His contemporaries to indicate that He was known before He left His village home for His baptism in the river Jordan. There is no evidence of any rumour about an extraordinary Person residing in Nazareth. The meagre references of the people in His village and district who did know something about Him show their astonishment at the remarkable powers He displayed. His own family were surprised and not altogether pleased with the sensation He caused; it was a notoriety out of keeping with the reputation they were content to enjoy. They had evidently seen nothing in His life to indicate that these marvels were to be expected. He was not even considered the most religious member of the family. For was it not James who had gained a reputation for rigid religious observance? For thirty years Jesus had lived with His family, and they had observed nothing more unusual than a constant readiness to help.

Jesus never sought fame—the fame which men love. They will risk life itself, they will face the cannon which pour forth destruction into the midst of them, to win renown, and 'fly victorious in the mouths of men.' This passion to win fame is not so grovellingly ignoble as that love of money which is a root of all kinds of evil.

Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise
(That last infirmity of noble mind)
To scorn delights and live laborious days;
But the fair guerdon when we hope to find,
And think to burst out into sudden blaze,
Comes the blind Fury with the abhorred shears,
And slits the thin-spun life.

It is infinitely difficult for men to rid themselves of this passion, although in age after age the greatest have been among the saddest of mankind. *Omnia fui, et nihil expedit,* sighed the Roman Emperor who had risen from lowliness to the topmost summit of earthly grandeur. 'All my life long I have been prosperous in peace and victorious in war, feared by my enemies, loved and honoured by my friends,' wrote Abdalrahman the Magnificent, in his private diary. 'Amid all this wealth and glory I have counted the days of my life which I could call happy. They amount to fourteen.'

'I never spent such tedious hours in all my life,' exclaimed Napoleon I., as he flung into the corners of the room the superb coronation robes which he had worn when the Pope of Rome, in the Cathedral of Nôtre Dame, had placed the crown of St. Louis on the brows of him who had, a few years before, been the poor struggling sub-lieutenant of artillery. 'Right well know I that Fame is half-disfame'—such are the words which Tennyson puts into the mouth of the mighty Merlin:

'Sweet were the days when I was all unknown,
But when my name was lifted up, the storm
Brake on the mountain and I cared not for it.
Right well know I that Fame is half-disfame,
. . . . . .
The cackle of the unborn about the grave,
I cared not for it.'

And so the 'Emptiness of emptiness, emptiness of emptiness, all is emptiness', of the richest, wisest, and most splendid of earthly kings has been sound-

[1] G. Robinson Lees, *The Life of Christ,* 39.

ing through the centuries; and with that verdict of disillusionment comes the old wise lesson, 'Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not, saith the Lord.' Jesus gave to the lesson of this world-wide experience His seal of confirmation by His unknown years at Nazareth; and thus, by example as by His words, He says to us: 'Come unto me . . . for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls.'

2. *They were years of toil.*—Jesus was content to stay in the ranks of common toilers. His reputed father was a carpenter, and He continued in the same trade. He did not strive to enter the law, which was the most influential profession among the Jews. He did not hunt around for some more rapid way of making money, but contentedly toiled on. There is a great deal said in these days about 'getting on in the world,' by which it is meant that young men should get off the farms and out of the trades into the professions and offices, and that everybody should get rich. Success is an emphatic word in our vocabulary. Now, it is undoubtedly true that every one should endeavour to develop his powers to the fullest measure in useful service, and this noble ambition should especially inspire the young. But this cry of 'getting on in the world' generally sets up false ideals and hopes, and works great harm. And worse still, it sets up a false standard of manhood. It measures worth by wealth, and attainment by position. But the truth is that men in getting up in this sense often get down. The true standard of manhood is something immeasurably better than wealth and something that every one can attain. 'I believe,' says Charles Kingsley, 'that a man might be, as a tailor or as a carpenter, every inch of him a saint, a scholar, and a gentleman.' A saint, a scholar, and a gentleman: these are the qualities that constitute a true man, and every man, whatever his station in life, can have them. Jesus was as truly a saint, a scholar, and a gentleman while making ploughs and ox-yokes as while preaching the Sermon on the Mount.

There has been a tendency in all ages to despise manual labour, and look down on those who live by it. All trade and mechanic work was to the ancient world despicable, a thing to be left to slaves, or those but a little above them. So it was in the days of the Roman Empire; so it was even among our Teutonic forefathers. A 'base mechanic' was quite an ordinary description in the days of Queen Elizabeth for the mass of the people, and to this day it is considered an immense disparagement to call a man 'a mere tradesman.' The Jews alone among the nations rose to a wiser standpoint, though even among them we find such haughty sentences as: 'How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough . . . whose talk is of bullocks?'. But the lot of artisans was infinitely raised among the Jews by the fact that the greatest Rabbis were taught that it was well to be able to maintain themselves by a trade. What sublimer lesson could Jesus have taught to mankind than by spending thirty unknown years as the humble Carpenter of Nazareth? How fundamentally did He thus rectify the judgments of man's feeble and erring day! How did He thus illustrate the truth that 'all honest labour is an honour to the labourer'! How did He further demonstrate by this example, that man has no essential dignity except that which comes from his inherent nature as created in the image of God!

In viewing the youth of Jesus, we must not see Him, even in His outward life, as a mere tradesman tied to the workshop at Nazareth. His intelligence and keen human sympathy carried Him far beyond that narrow environment, and led Him to view the wide outlook of the world. But, on the other hand, it were unseemly and untrue to think of Him as detached from stated occupation, such as was of immediate use. There was a place for labour in the experience of Jesus, and even a necessity that He should share this one among the ordinary burdens of His fellow-men. His career as a student of Hebrew letters was early closed; now He must study the world in a view both wide and long; and this is a study that is never helped by idleness of the hands. At no stage of His life that was preparatory to His ministry can we imagine Jesus to have been either unable or disinclined to do the ordinary work of a man. So it was that He entered on that course of life which led to His being known for many years as the Carpenter of Nazareth; and the place of His early outlook was enlarged to be the place of that wider outlook in which He walked to His ministry.

If I could hold within my hand
The hammer Jesus swung,
Not all the gold in all the land,
Nor jewels countless as the sand,
All in the balance flung,
Could weigh the value of that thing
Round which His fingers once did cling.

If I could have the table He
Once made in Nazareth,
Not all the pearls in all the sea,
Nor crowns of kings or kings to be
As long as men have breath,
Could buy that thing of wood He made
The Lord of lords who learned a trade.

Yea, but His hammer still is shown
By honest hands that toil,
And round His table men sit down;
And all are equals, with a crown
Nor gold nor pearls can soil;
The shop at Nazareth was bare—
But Brotherhood was builded there.[1]

3. *They were years of poverty.*—Poverty is the normal lot of the vast majority of mankind. There was nothing squalid, nothing degrading in this poverty. It was the modest competence, earned by manly toil, which suffices to provide all that men truly need, though not all that they passionately desire. It was the poverty which is content with food and raiment. Men, by myriads, strive passionately for wealth.[2]

They strive and agonize for gold; they toil and moil, and cheat and steal, and oppress, and poison, and ruin their brethren to get money; they sell their souls, they turn their whole lives into a degradation and a lie, because of the false glamour of riches. The old song says rightly:

The gods from above the mad labour behold,
And pity mankind who would perish for gold.

Yet, after all, it is but the very few who, with all their passionate endeavours, attain to riches. The Dives who is clad in purple and fine linen, and fares sumptuously every day, is but one out of every hundred thousand; and very often his earthly wealth tends only to dehumanize his heart. The lesson of Christ's poverty has helped myriads of the humble to say, with brave Martin Luther, 'My God, I thank Thee that Thou hast made me poor and a beggar upon earth.' And as the wise king had prayed: 'Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me'; so Christ, by the example of these long, silent years of poverty, gave deeper emphasis to His own teaching: 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.' In the workshop at Nazareth, faithful in that which was little, Christ revealed to mankind where to seek and how to enjoy the true riches. By long example He added force to His own precept: 'Be not anxious for the morrow, for the morrow will be anxious for the things of itself.' 'Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment?'

[1] Charles M. Sheldon.
[2] F. W. Farrar, *The Life of Lives*, 128.

Second Sunday after Trinity.

The Quest for God.

'Oh that I knew where I might find him!'—Job 23[3].

Job's cry for speech with God may be regarded as the cry of the human soul after God, 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!' His cry is for God. It goes straight to the mark, right over all lower things. We should not have been surprised if he had cried for relief from his troubles, but that was not what his heart was set upon. His heart was set on God. His case was extreme, and none but God could answer it. His friends would not believe in his goodness. They believed only in God's justice. He believes in God's justice as firmly as they do, and to that justice he at last appeals. Impatient of their well-meaning attempts to comfort him, he gets at length wearied out, and in effect says to them, 'Be done with your moralizing, I am sick of it: enough of this wrangling, let me go direct to God, and He will put my character in its true light.' He felt he had come to a crisis in his life, when none but God could avail. And so, brushing aside all the methods suggested by his miserable comforters he sends his cry direct to the throne—a cry of intense earnestness, the cry of one who knows his distress and seeks the only sure refuge. Give me God and I have enough. He is my refuge from attacks, and my portion in poverty. Let me lose all, says Job, only let me find Him. 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!'

Now, when Job uttered this cry, he unconsciously struck the keynote of universal desire. It has found

an echo in every age and every land. It may be truly said, 'There is no speech nor language where its voice is not heard; its sound has gone out through all the earth, and its words to the end of the world.' Even in the grey dawn of time we see human hands stretched out to heaven in quest of God, and all along the dark and tangled path of history the search has gone on. Every pagan system, every heathen temple, every graven image, every blood-stained altar has been but the cry of the soul after God. Men have always been conscious of God. St. Paul's words to the Athenians on Mars Hill are a true reading of history, and a true reading of human nature—that all men are so constituted that they should seek the Lord if haply they might feel after Him and find Him. It is the explanation of the altar with the inscription 'To the unknown God.' Even when men have no definite knowledge of God they are forced by the very needs of their nature, driven by inner necessity, to reach out after Him. Man is a religious being. He feels himself related to a power above him, and knows himself a spirit longing for fellowship with the Divine. It is as truly in response to the hunger of his soul as seeking food is to the hunger of his body. All the religions of the world that have been, and that are, bear witness that Job's longing is, in some form or other, universal; and many forms of unbelief are only more pathetic witnesses to the same fact.

1. In their quest after God men have gone in many directions, without finding any clear way to the living God. *Nature* told men there was a creator, but it failed to point the way to His seat. It simply said—God is, and all things were made by Him. It has many sweet voices, charming sounds, and lovely sights. But the very perfection of Nature hides the creator from us. If this world on which we dwell made us conscious of its existence by some grating noise or some jolting movement, we would be more likely to consider its Maker. But it spins at an enormous speed quietly through space.

But, even if we realize that Nature speaks to us of God, have we not a feeling that man stands outside? He is an outsider in the great world in which he dwells. He looks at the growing corn or springing flower, and he feels that these things are growing up, and drawing from the earth the power that nourishes their being. They respond to the great forces in nature, and they bring forth their fruit with a quiet and unobtrusive obedience. Like Gareth as he stood and watched the spate as it tumbled down among the rocks and cried out to himself:

> Thou dost His will,
> The Maker's, and not knowest, and I that know,
> Have strength and wit, in my good mother's hall
> Linger with vacillating obedience,
> Prison'd.

As time goes on we are always knowing more about Nature, and consequently a little more about God. In the early stages of civilization man was dominated by fear. Nature seemed to him so capricious. He could not calculate when an avalanche might come. He had no knowledge of thunder and lightning. The earthquake and the drought surprised him. This sense of uncertainty created fear. Now men understand that they are not living in a capricious world, but that they are living in an orderly world, where seed time and harvest, summer and winter, shall not cease. 'He hath given them a law which shall not be broken,' the Psalmist says. And as we realize that we are living in a world governed by law there comes a sense of security. And with the sense of security there comes a conviction that there is a faithfulness about the God of Nature. But we want more than this. Nature's message is for an innocent race. It has no sound of help to the guilty. It can give no sufficient reply to the question—'Oh that I knew where I might find him!'

2. To some extent God reveals Himself in *history*, in its epochs of advance, its awful times of decay, and in its frightful scenes that make the heart of man stand still. As Froude said, history is a voice that thunders through the ages the laws of right and wrong. A large part of the Bible itself is history, and God reveals Himself in the historical books as well as in the Psalms and Prophets. When we follow the history of the Israelites we can see the method of God's revelation of Himself to mankind, and the way in which He led them on to a fuller understanding of His ways of working in the world.

3. And in the *lives of men and women*, too, we have some vision of God. There are souls so great and pure that the hidden God seems to walk beside us and hallow the way. Heine, the German poet, confessed surprise that 'after dancing nearly half a lifetime over the waxen floors of philosophy,'

he had to come at last to sit at the feet of Uncle Tom in his Cabin to learn the meaning of the word God. Heine knew logic and philosophy: he was a poet and a wit, but intellect alone could not find God. But if God is not found in fullness either in nature, or history, or humanity, where is He found?

4. In the fullness of time He revealed Himself in *Jesus Christ*. The old question, 'Shall God indeed dwell with man on earth?' was answered when the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. The Divine Spirit wore our human form, used our human speech, and expressed Himself in words of beauty and works of mercy. Because He was veiled in human form there were doubters even amongst His friends. 'Show us the Father,' said Philip. To which Jesus replied, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Had the Eternal Son not come in the flesh we would never have known God or understood about His Fatherhood. Too often God was thought of as dwelling apart from His creation, aloof and inaccessible; as one who stood outside the world, letting it go its own way. With that picture in mind it is hard to find any reality in God when His children are suffering and struggling here.

But this is a false idea of the teaching of Christianity. In the New Testament do we not find a contest in which not only men are engaged but powers above and beyond men? And in that struggle God takes the supreme part. What else does the Incarnation mean?

> O generous love! that He Who smote
> In Man, for man, the foe
> The double agony in Man,
> For man, should undergo.

In Christ God is acting. Christ is God doing things. Where in any world religion will you find that truth expressed save in the gospel of Christ? 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' And what does the Cross mean but that God is in the midst of the world's struggle bearing the cost of it in pain; and not there as the victim but as the victor? At Calvary the quest is ended. And this end of the quest is not the end of life, but its beginning, which enables us to be remade in His likeness.

The Apocryphal Gospels.

By the Reverend Alfred Plummer, D.D., formerly Master of University College, Durham.

I.

'Apocrypha,' when used of writings (*ἀπόκρυφα βιβλία*), may mean either 'kept in concealment,' 'hidden or stored away'; or 'of concealed origin,' 'of unknown authorship.' In the former sense it is commonly *laudatory*; in the latter not, but rather *depreciatory* or even *contemptuous*. A book may be kept in concealment for various reasons. Because it is worn out, and yet is too precious to be destroyed, as was often the case when the Scriptures were written on rolls of papyrus, which were being constantly handled in the synagogues. Or, because it is difficult to understand, and therefore unfit for general use; only the elect few being able to read it without risk of evil to themselves. Or, because it refers to a distant future, and cannot be understood by any one until the time arrives. Thus Daniel is charged: 'The vision of the evenings and mornings which hath been told is true; but thou, shut thou up the vision, for it belongeth to many days' (*i.e.* to a distant time), $8^{14.\ 26}$; and again, as a closing injunction: 'But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book, until the time of the end' (*i.e.* the persecution under Antiochus); and 'Go, Daniel, for the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end,' when they will become intelligible, $12^{4.\ 9}$. Cf. the Book of Enoch 1^{2}; the Assumption of Moses $1^{16.\ 17}$. That this 'stored up' literature was highly estimated among the Jews is evident. Ezra is supposed to have restored the Books of the O.T. which had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, after being specially inspired to dictate them to five men who were specially equipped for writing swiftly. 'So in forty days were written ninety-four Books. And it came to pass when the forty days were fulfilled, that the Most High spake unto me, saying: The twenty-four Books that thou hast written publish, that the worthy and unworthy may read; but the seventy last thou

shalt keep, to deliver them to the wise among thy people. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge' (4 Ezr 14^{44-47}). The twenty-four Books are the O.T. The seventy are the apocalypses, which few could appreciate or understand. From the production of the Book of Daniel onwards Judaism was flooded with apocalyptic literature, which in certain quarters was highly estimated.

But 'Apocrypha' did not always mean 'stored away' as being of great value or special interest. It sometimes means 'of unknown origin,' 'of doubtful authorship,' and thus it easily acquires a bad signification. What is obscure in origin, and not very clear in meaning, is regarded with suspicion. Its teaching is likely to be pernicious and its claim to authority false. In this way 'Apocrypha' often seems to imply what is now generally understood by the term 'apocryphal.' The etymological connexion between the two terms is in some respects unfortunate, for it inevitably leads to the inference that the O.T. Books which are called 'The Apocrypha' are in some sense false, and hence that it is better not to read them. Whereas during the last fifty years scholars of nearly all Christian communions have continually told us that these uncanonical Books are indispensable for true understanding of both the Old Testament and the New. They show us the trend of religious thought among the Jews in the long interval during which no Prophet spoke or wrote.

There are uncanonical writings connected with the New Testament, and they are even more numerous than those which are connected with the Old. But they differ from the latter very considerably in character; and the term which is commonly applied to them is not 'Apocrypha,' but 'apocryphal,' and 'apocryphal' in a decidedly bad sense. The O.T. Apocrypha may be regarded as a supplement to the Canonical Books; an innocent attempt at continuing the records in the historical Books, and the instructions in the writings of the Prophets, without any claim to Divine authority or profession of special inspiration. But the apocryphal additions to the N.T. are by no means innocent in design. They are meant to deceive. The deception is by no means always the same: it differs in amount and in evilness of character. In some cases the main object is simply to gratify the curiosity which many of us feel with regard to the N.T. narratives, because so much that we greatly desire to know is not recorded there. Some of the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts attempt to fill up the gaps, professing to have authority for what they add to the contents of the Canonical Books. In other cases the object has apparently or evidently been to suggest and promote the acceptance of certain false doctrines. Some have a manifestly heretical bias.

These apocryphal writings fall naturally into four classes; Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Revelations. We possess many of them, and we know the titles of others which at one time were in circulation. Some of them, especially the spurious Acts of Apostles, have had much permanent effect by originating or promoting traditions about religious doctrine and ritual, and legends about persons and events.

In the present paper we have to confine our attention to the first of the four classes—Apocryphal Gospels, the study of which is by no means a mere investigation of an early and curious kind of fiction. If conducted with seriousness and intelligence, it leads directly to a strong confirmation of the Christian Creed, by exhibiting the impressive contrasts which, in many directions, are glaringly conspicuous between these spurious Gospels and the four which we have ample reasons for believing to be authentic and divinely inspired.

It might be thought that these Apocryphal Gospels have already been amply studied, analysed, and classified by scholars of the first rank, and that any further discussion of them would be mere repetition and waste of time. Repetition to a considerable extent there must be. But it may safely be asserted that, if the repetition is of the right sort, and is mingled with explanations and criticisms of a simple kind, such work will not be wasted.

The many standard works on the subject which already exist are, for the most part, intended for experts and for students of theology and ecclesiastical history. Many of them are written in Latin, or German, or French, and could not be read by the multitudes of intelligent and fairly educated Christians who know no language but English. And many of the essays on the subject which are written in English exist only in encyclopædias and dictionaries, or in extensive theological works which are unknown to the ordinary Christian, or, if known, are practically inaccessible. Even the very useful volume on the subject, published in 1870 by Messrs. T. & T. Clark in the 'Library of Ante-Nicene

Theology,' is probably not known to many and is used by few, excepting theological students. Consequently, a large number of intelligent Christians, who are doubtful as to the attitude which they ought to adopt towards the perplexing criticisms of the Gospels which they find in newspapers, magazines, and novels, lose a very interesting, intelligible, and convincing method of strengthening their trust in the most important and indispensable portion of the N.T. They do not know of the existence of this helpful literature.[1]

Apocryphal Acts have come down to us in far greater abundance than Apocryphal Gospels, and were probably always more numerous. They were more easy to invent, and were less jealously criticized. They were to the early ages of the Church what Lives of Saints were to mediæval times, and what novels are to our own. But the Apocryphal Gospels which have survived are only a fragment—'scarcely the tenth part' (Lipsius)—of a literature which at one time was very extensive. About fifty are known to us. We have seven in their entirety, and fragments of many others; but of some we know only the names; and it is probably true to say that we have none in their original form. Nevertheless we have abundant materials for the instructive comparison mentioned above. Some of these were composed with the innocent object of preserving traditions about Christ and His disciples which the writers found floating about in various quarters, and which they thought worthy of preservation. The effort to put these into definite shape involved a certain amount of imagination, but there was little or no attempt to deceive. More often there are traces of attempts to insinuate doctrines which were not taught in the Catholic Church. Even in such cases there is not a very great deal of pure invention. The writers enlarge what are mere hints in the Gospels; they transform Christ's words into actions, attribute miracles to Him which are based upon miracles recorded in the O.T. or in the N.T., but are often repulsive in their new and exaggerated form. Sometimes they take Jewish anticipations respecting the Messiah and record a definite fulfilment of them as having taken place. But in these cases, although the writers had the Canonical Gospels as models, yet the poverty and clumsiness of their imitations are often amazing. They seem, in most cases, to have had little sense of the beauty of the originals, or of the want of it in their own attempts. At times one is inclined to suspect that the authors were under the impression that they *excelled* the Canonical Gospels in effectiveness.

It is remarkable, but not very surprising, that these Apocryphal Gospels were received by the Catholic Church far less readily than the much more numerous Apocryphal Acts. Stories of the labours and troubles of Apostles, even if they had little or no foundation, could easily be made harmless, or even edifying. If there were any insinuations of false doctrine, these could easily be expunged. Something of the same kind might be said of the stories about Joseph and Mary and her parents, previous to the Nativity. But expansions of the facts recorded in the Canonical Gospels were looked upon with grave suspicion, especially with regard to the utterances attributed to our Lord.[2] It was here that Gnostic and other unwholesome ideas could be inserted or implied. It is just possible that in a very few instances the utterances thus attributed to Him are based upon a true tradition; but it is not likely that true traditions about His sayings were still in circulation after A.D. 200.

There are critics who ask us to believe that what is recorded in our Gospels is, in the main, imagination and invention. The Evangelists show us, not what Jesus of Nazareth really said and did, but what certain Christians in the second century thought that one who claimed to be the Messiah would be likely to have said and done. These Christians believed that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and therefore they attributed to Him the kind of conduct which they thought would be suitable. The Apocryphal Gospels show us the kind of material that we should have had if Chris-

[1] The following admirable articles on Apocryphal Gospels may be accessible to some persons; by Professor Lipsius of Jena (one of the very highest authorities) in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. ii., 1880; by Principal Tasker, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v., 1904; by R. H. Charles, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. ii., 11th edition, 1910; by Professor Moffatt, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, vol. i., 1915. This last, if only on account of its recent date, is specially worthy of study; and the learning of the writer is well known.

[2] In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 6) we read of poisonous apocryphal books in which the wicked heretics reproach the creation, marriage, the providential government of the world, whose doctrine eschew, etc.

tians of the second century had constructed the Gospels out of the products of their own imagination. It is only when the constructors of them keep closely to the Canonical Gospels that they are edifying. Even with these to guide them, these writers in most cases (not quite in all) give us what is uninspiring, often what is silly, and sometimes what is blankly immoral.

But we must be cautious in our criticisms, especially in the case of those uncanonical Gospels of which we possess only fragments; and (as already stated) they are far the most numerous. In some cases the fragments occur in writers whose object is to exhibit the unsatisfactory character of the Gospel which they quote. What is not quoted may have had better features. But, as in the case of the 'New Sayings of Jesus,' discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1897, and edited by Grenfell and Hunt in 1904, it is rarely that we 'come upon any touches or traditions which even suggest that by their help we can fill out the description of the Synoptic Gospels' (Moffatt).

A few quotations will illustrate the kind of statements made as to the historical worthlessness of the Canonical Gospels. 'The four Gospels are a hash of fragments. Many of their alleged facts are fictions indeed' (Kenealy). 'No historian would care to undertake an attempt to produce the biography of an historical Christ' (A. Drews). 'In default of any historical certainty the name of Jesus has become for Protestant theology an empty vessel' (Kalthoff).

In comparatively recent times it was not uncommon, in arguments about Church Order, to assume that our Lord must have given directions respecting the matter in dispute. As no such directions are recorded in the Gospels, it was maintained that He had given them in the forty days between the Resurrection and the Ascension. The convenience of this assumption was that a disputant could always contend that Christ's directions were in accordance with his own views respecting the primitive Church. The Apocryphal Gospels often served a similar purpose. The composers of them put into Christ's mouth doctrines which they wished to promote, and condemnations of doctrines which they wished to oppose. And whoever copied one of these uncanonical Gospels could vary these imaginary sayings at pleasure; for there was no standard text, such as quickly grew up in the case of the Canonical Gospels. It was difficult for Church authorities to cope with this evil. They could forbid the reading of these unauthorized Gospels in the public services of the Church; but they could not prevent their being read privately at home. And as these invented Gospels were often found to be very interesting, especially in their additions to the Canonical Gospels, they were widely read, not only silently by individuals, but aloud to companies who came to listen to them. Jn 21^{25} seemed almost to encourage such augmentations of the Canonical Gospels.

Contributions and Comments.

The Local Colour of the Bible.[1]

THE Bible is an Oriental book, and it can never be fully understood by one who does not know how far the East is distant from the West. This very interesting volume is a constant reminder of the distance between them. Both authors have earned their right to speak from a residence of some years in the Middle East, and the son of Dr. Hastings is sure of a welcome from the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for his father's sake as well as for his own.

[1] *The Local Colour of the Bible*, by Charles W. Budden, M.D., and the Rev. Edward Hastings, M.A. (T. & T. Clark; pp. 356; 8s. net).

The work is to be completed in three volumes; this volume carries the study from Genesis to the end of Second Samuel. The plan of the authors is to pursue their way through the books of the Bible in regular order, dividing them up into convenient sections, and selecting within each section for special discussion incidents, allusions, and customs which require for their thorough understanding a knowledge of the East; and the general effect is to restore the Bible to its ancient setting, and to enable its readers to see it with the light of the East upon it.

All sorts of interests pass in review before us—history, geography, archæology, ethnology, mar-

riage customs, funeral customs, ritual practices, social institutions such as slavery, blessings, curses, dress, and endless other things. The section on Exodus, *e.g.*, offers much interesting information on Egypt, whose wonderful civilization is engaging the attention of the world at the moment; the section on Samuel deals with ancient Hebrew religion, childhood in Palestine, Shiloh, the Philistines, the Syrian shepherd, etc. An immense amount of valuable information is gathered from innumerable sources in books and travel within these unpretentious pages, and there is real illumination upon many a Bible scene. Many quaint and curious things are scattered across the chapters, not the least of these being the suggestion of James Neil that the 'water-brooks' of Ps 42[1] is a mistranslation for aqueduct or pipe. 'A deer would not "pant" or "bray" for water if it were standing over an open stream. The psalmist thirsts after God and longs to taste again the joy of His house, like the parched and weary hind, who comes to a covered channel conveying the living waters of some far-off spring across the intervening desert. She scents the precious current in its bed of adamantine cement, even hears its rippling flow close beneath her feet, or perchance sees the living water through one of the narrow air-holes; and, as she realizes the inaccessibility of the draught, she lifts up her head in her anguish and brays over the aqueducts.'

For a volume of this kind the attitude of the writers to critical and literary problems matters little. In any case that attitude is not radical. The psalm just quoted, *e.g.*, appears to be regarded as Davidic, and on p. 196 the manna is alluded to as a 'miraculous gift,' whereas on p. 95 we are told that 'the manna which is found to-day in the Peninsula of Sinai resembles the manna described in the Pentateuch.' The purpose of the book is to re-create the Biblical atmosphere, and this purpose is admirably fulfilled. It might indeed be described as 'Pleasant Studies in Biblical Archæology.' The value of the book would be considerably enhanced by the addition of a few simple maps and illustrations; but this would increase its price, which is modest enough to bring it within the range of all who aspire to a more vivid understanding of the Bible. The two remaining volumes will be awaited with eager interest.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Muḥammad and the 'Diatessaron.'

IN the *Mohammedan Studies* of the late Professor Goldziher there is an important section on the influence of the New Testament which can be traced in the Ḥadīth or Moslem traditions; amongst these traditions, known under various titles and ascribed to various authors, the most important is the Ḥadīth Qudsī, much of which is of the highest value for the reconstruction of the history of the Islamic movement, and of the relations between the Prophet and his Companions.

Goldziher points out (vol. i. p. 386) that, amongst the various loans from the teaching and the text of the Gospel, the most important is the use of the Lord's Prayer, which use is attributed to the Prophet himself. The following statement is made on the faith of Abu-l-Dardā,'[1] that the Prophet once said: 'If any one suffers, or his brother is suffering, he may say: Our Lord God, thou who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy Name, thy Kingdom is in Heaven and on Earth; as thy mercy [is] in Heaven, so practise thy mercy also on Earth; forgive us our debt and our sins (*ḥaubanâ wa-khaṭâjâna*); thou art the Lord God of the good; send down mercy from thy mercy and healing from thy healing upon this pain, in order that he may again be well.'

Here, then, we have the use of the Lord's Prayer, in a somewhat mutilated and shortened form, employed as a spell to be used over sick people, and the authority for such use is the Prophet himself. The prayer is Islamized by the substitution of 'Our Lord God' for 'Our Father,' for as the Moslems would say, 'He neither begets nor is begotten,' and 'God forbid that God should have a son'; but no one can doubt that this is the Lord's Prayer, nor that it was used as a magical spell in the earliest days of Islam.

We come now to a most important detail, which Goldziher has overlooked, namely, that the Prayer must have come into Moslem use, and probably into the hands of the Prophet himself, from a Syriac source, and this source the *Diatessaron* of Tatian.

Observe, in the first place, the expression used for forgiveness, 'our debt and our sins'; the first term is almost exactly the language of Luke, the second that of Matthew in the Syriac Gospels; the combination of them into a single formula is suggestive at once of Tatian and the *Diatessaron*.

[1] Quoted in Abû Dāwûd, i. 101.

Any doubt that might remain, after noting the linguistic agreement and the harmonization, would be swept away by the observation (as Dr. Mingana reminds me), that to this day all branches of the Syrian Church use the composite form ('debts and sins') in the Lord's Prayer. We cannot doubt that this consent in liturgical usage is primitive, and that it is due to Tatian himself. Muḥammad, then, was under Syrian influence, learnt the Lord's Prayer in Syriac, and advised its use as a magical spell for healing.

The importance of these considerations will be evident to the student of the New Testament. In the nature of the case, one of the first things a primitive Syrian Christian would learn is the Lord's Prayer; the evidence is that this religious ABC was learned from Tatian. This does not necessarily mean that there were no separate Gospels before Tatian; the terms combined for 'debts' and 'sins' are the actual terms which stand to-day in the text of the Peshitta, and which doubtless stood in the first texts of the separate Syriac Gospels; so that the question of priority remains open, whether Tatian is the first Syriac Gospel, or whether he had antecedent texts in Syriac. There can be no question as to his ecclesiastical dominance over the whole of the Eastern Christians, before their subdivision into separated confessions and ever since.

It may be asked whether the Arabic text of the *Diatessaron* as published by Ciasca has the same transference of Syriac terms into Arabic. The answer is in the negative; the Arabic text uses other words and makes no combination; but this does not invalidate the evidence which we have brought forward nor the conclusions which we have drawn. The Arabic Tatian is not true Tatian at this point.

RENDEL HARRIS.

Manchester.

The Text of Ezekiel xix. 7.

IN the dirge over the princes of Judah the opening words of v.[7], וַיֵּדַע אַלְמְנוֹתָיו, have proved a *crux interpretum*. Both words are difficult, but the R.V. marg. is not possible in the context. In Is 13[22], באלמנותיו is simply an error for ״בארמ (although Fried. Delitzsch defends the M.T. on the analogy of As. *almattu*, 'fortress'), and so the R.V. renders it. For a lion 'to know the palaces' of his enemies appears rather pointless. I would suggest that the clue to the original text is found in the Sept. reading ἐνέμετο. νέμω, in the Mid. voice (*v.* Liddell and Scott, νέμω B. 2), is used (*a*) of cattle grazing, and also of a lioness (Eur. *El.* 1163) ranging for prey; (*b*) and metaphorically of fire, disease, and even falsehood 'devouring,' 'consuming.' In Hebrew, רָעָה has similar usages. This would lead to the conclusion that וַיִּרַע stood in the original text. There is a play upon the word in Mic 5[5], where the R.V. translates וְרָעוּ 'And they shall waste,' viz. the land of Assyria. Cf. also Jer 22[22]. In Job 20[26], יֵרַע itself occurs immediately after the word אכל, as in Ezekiel's dirge, if we follow the hint of the Sept. In addition, the slight change in the text yields the parallel required for the next clause, which speaks of the destruction of cities: 'And he devastated their palaces, and their cities he laid waste.'

H. A. WILLIAMSON.

Lochee.

Dr. Garvie's Book on the Fourth Gospel.

('THE BELOVED DISCIPLE.')

GARVIE and I were at College together; since those days, we have met only as 'ships that pass in the night'; and it is interesting therefore to note that, thirty years later, we stand together. 'Christian faith has its unshaken foundation, not in religious ideas and moral ideals, but in historical facts, in the historical personality, by whom God is revealed, and man redeemed, the Son who makes the Father known that men may find eternal life in Him'—the closing words of his book, might have been my own. In particular, our attitude to the Fourth Gospel is similar, and a few notes of impression after reading his book may be useful.

'We have got past Westcott' is one reviewer's verdict. I have not pawned my Westcott; and I would rather say: We have got beyond Scott and Strachan. Personally I have never been able to find help in their methods, and am grateful to Garvie for his judgment thereon.

The chief value of this book is that in it you see a critic dealing, not with documents primarily, but with the men behind the documents. He goes a long way behind the men to the Man of whom they are trying to write; though here he may go further yet. We are delivered from Ephesus and brought back to Jerusalem. We know that Matthew Arnold was right when he said that Christ was greater

than His reporters. But this truth is still needing fuller recognition.

It seems to me, then, that the book marks a stage. Our work henceforth will be affected by it. And, this being borne in mind, I wish to record some points of dissent.

(1) I am entirely sceptical about Garvie's treatment of chapters 6 and 21. In order to emphasize the fact that the beloved disciple belonged to Jerusalem, our author has sought to depreciate the Galilean narratives. I think this entirely gratuitous, and the discussion quite unconvincing. 6^{15} is the key to the entire Gospel history. But here I only wish to record my dissent.

(2) The rearrangements of the Fourth Gospel attributed to Moffatt and Thompson are mostly my work ('Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel,' *Interpreter*, 1911, pp. 109 f., 331). It is true that Moffatt adopts the rearrangements in his Translation without reference, but that reference is fully made in his *Introduction*[3] (551–7). This omission is not important except that, had Garvie seen my book, he might have been helped by the suggestions there made as to chronology.

(3) Unfortunately I must make another reference to work of my own (*Interpreter*, 1910, pp. 384 ff.). Years ago I showed that some twelve to fifteen verses of the Gospel were insertions by an editor, all of the same kind, misinterpretations thrust into and interrupting the narrative. If Garvie had noted this, he would not, for example, have attributed 12^{6} to the witness's detestation of Judas. It is simply a wooden intrusion. But, more important, this clue would have enabled our author the better to isolate the fumbling work of the Redactor.

As it is, I feel that Garvie's division of the Gospel between 'witness,' 'evangelist,' and 'redactor' needs serious revision.

And has E. A. Abbott's work been overlooked?

F. Warburton Lewis.

Crouch Hill.

Note on St. John xvi. 23, 24.

The contrast implied by the use of the two words ἐρωτάω and αἰτέω is more than usually suggestive, though most commentators seem indifferent to the distinction. Westcott does deal with it but is inclined to put the emphasis on ἐμέ. So also Weiss (*Evangelium des Johannes*). Reference to classical usage may not help us much, yet there, according to Trench, ἐρωτάω never signifies 'to ask,' but 'to interrogate' or 'inquire' (Lat. *rogo*, or, as in the above text, *interrogo*). It is also used in dialectic to elicit conclusions from the opponent by means of questioning. On the other hand, αἰτέω (Lat. *peto*) means 'to beg,' 'to crave,' or even 'to demand for oneself.'

Now the context would seem to imply that ἐρωτάω is used of fruitless questions, impertinent, in the sense that they are not to the point; and αἰτέω is used of serious, pertinent questions. Thus: 'In that day ye shall ask (ἐρωτήσετε) me nothing,' *i.e.* nothing fruitless, perplexing, or pointless; because the time for that kind of questioning will have passed. Again: 'Hitherto ye have asked (ᾐτήσατε) nothing in my name,' *i.e.* nothing pertinent. 'Ask (αἰτεῖτε) and ye shall receive,' *i.e.* Ask seriously and to the point and your very question will be an answer.

Once again we read (Mk 12^{34}): 'And no man after that durst ask (ἐπερωτῆσαι) him any question,' *i.e.* any impertinent question.

It is the distinction between a religion of questions and the religion of answers. The first, if it be not merely flippant, is sheer pragmatism, in its commonest and worst form. Compare Ps 4^{6}: 'Who will show us any good?' This is the level of ἐρωτάω. The assumption is that there is no good in life except what is good for *me*. The individual is the measure of all things. But the good of life cannot come to us independently, without regard for the good of others: 'Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.' This is the level of αἰτέω. The question of faith supplies its own answer. It is the question of St. Paul: 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' No answers will come to random questions (cf. Job). The demand of faith is for the Object of its quest. It provides answers by removing the need for questions.

E. Macmillan.

The Manse, Pretoria.

Tasting.

In The Expository Times, vol. xxiv. p. 91 (November 1912), I was permitted to refer to the use of the word γεύομαι in the N.T. as meaning 'a conscious personal experience,' not merely the fact of participation, and it was suggested that this thought of personal experience gives special

point to all the passages where the word occurs. My attention has now been further drawn to the subject, and I have read in a little magazine, *The Berean Expositor*, some suggestions which I desire to pass on for consideration by others. It is contended that the main thought of the word is not merely experience, but also and chiefly the fact of 'sampling,' or tasting only. It is obvious that in Mt 27^{34} the word 'taste' does not mean to 'drink,' and the same distinction seems to be a legitimate idea in Jn 2^{9}. It is curious that γεύομαι in Acts is rendered by 'eat' in the three instances where it is found in that book (10^{10} 20^{11} 23^{21}), though by 'taste' in all the other places. In the second and third of these passages in Acts there is a clear distinction between 'tasting' and partaking of the full meal, but the usage in He $6^{4.5}$ and 1 P $2^{3.4}$ is not so clear in this respect. But it is certainly possible, and even seems necessary, to draw the distinction in several of the places. It is suggested in the article to which I now refer that this interpretation helps us to understand the difficult passage. 'There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (Mt 16^{28}). Inasmuch as all these men died before the Lord's Return, it is obvious that some other meaning than dying must be discovered; and as our Lord did not say 'shall not die,' but 'shall not taste death,' may He not have been referring to what He had just been teaching them about 'taking up his cross' and 'losing his soul'? This, it is maintained, is virtually equivalent to 'tasting death,' for to take up the cross and to lose one's soul, though not actually dying, is to experience something of its power. But the disciples were not permitted to suffer anything for Christ until they had, first of all, seen the vision of His glory on the Mount of Transfiguration, which was so evidently connected with His 'decease' which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. It is decidedly noteworthy that in all the three parallels where the phrase 'taste of death' first occurs, the Lord speaks of losing the soul for His sake, and then comes the record of the Transfiguration. This suggestion is certainly ingenious, and the idea of a distinction between 'tasting' and fully eating appears to be quite clear in a majority of the passages, fifteen in number, where this word occurs.

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

Philadelphia, U.S.A.

The Fourth Cry from the Cross.

In the issue for April 1922 of The Expository Times, a question was raised by Rev. J. M. Ballard, Falkirk, regarding the Fourth Cry from the Cross. No one seems to have taken up this interesting point, and perhaps the following explanation may help towards throwing some light on the subject.

The problem is this. How can Christ be quoting Ps 22, if on comparison the Greek cannot show any likeness to the original Hebrew? σαβάχθανι (*sabachtani*) cannot by any twisting come to represent עזבתני, *'azabtani*). This, however, drives us back upon the usual practice of the Lord, and we find that this was to use Aramaic, and not Hebrew. Now in Aramaic there is a word which exactly corresponds to the Greek σαβάχθανι, namely, שְׁבַק (*shbaḳ*), and in the Targum for the Psalms, which would be the Old Testament our Lord would know, the Targum reads this very verb שְׁבַק. One can well imagine the diction of this Targum impressing the mind of the young boy, as he learnt it in youth, perhaps at his mother's knee, and what if, in the great crisis of His life, this lesson of His early youth had come winging to His mind, as it has come to many another dying man?

A full discussion of this point will be found in Delitzsch's *Psalms*, vol. i. p. 381, footnote.

Thomas C. Gordon.

Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

The Social Question.

What is the most pressing duty of the Church to-day? Which part of the huge task committed to it by the Master lies closest to the mind and conscience of this generation of His folk? That depends where one looks, for the situation is not uniform. In America the sun is little more than rising on problems that have had a long day here.

Yonder, apparently, they are still wrestling, as we had to do thirty years ago, with the impinging of science and new thought upon the faith; they appear still to be largely content with charity in the sense in which we used it a generation back, while here that has grown out of date; and, amid a clamour not for charity but justice, the Church is face to face with the Social question. A quarter of a century ago in certain theological colleges they were founding chairs of Natural Science, showing where the pressure lay; but now what is required is teaching on Political Economy, for it is there the pinch comes in our time. Here in *International Aspects of Unemployment*, by Mr. Watson Kirkconnell (Allen & Unwin; 6s. 6d.), we have a right useful book, arresting, honest, well-informed, dealing with great masses of facts with masterly ease, giving a diagnosis of the state of this ailing world, and boldly offering a prescription towards a cure. Mr. Kirkconnell disclaims infallibility on a subject so immensely difficult. He himself is quite convinced, but he admits that other honest minds may differ from him. And for our part, here and there, we do. But it is always with diffidence, for obviously this is one with a right to his opinions and to a respectful hearing.

It is, indeed, never a pretty sight to see a man in a panic, and Mr. Kirkconnell is badly scared. Moreover he has a vivid pen, and can put his terrors into nightmare words. He looks at our modern cities, and ugly thoughts of Nineveh and Babylon keep slipping uncomfortably into the background of his uneasy mind: he views the world, and sees this stately edifice of our modern civilization, built up with such colossal pains, tottering ominously, swaying crazily before his eyes under the savage gusts. 'Unless prompt and drastic measures of co-operative relief are applied, death and dissolution may easily supervene, and the teeming millions of our urbanized world will then, like the individual cells of a tabescent body, pass at last into stinking oblivion beneath the mouldy ruins of a defunct civilization.' And it is all very largely due to the fact that an insane world refused to listen to these wise men, the economists, who alone kept telling it the truth, but preferred to be beguiled by statesmen and heady creatures with daft national aspirations, with the result that any one can see! So completely has the wheel gone full circle since Carlyle and Ruskin poured contempt upon the 'dismal science,' with its soulless negation of the first elements of Christianity! So interesting and surprising is this world; so impossible is it to foretell what one will meet round the very nearest corner!

Mr. Kirkconnell starts out from this that, whether it be the ideal system or not (and he is very severe on the 'gross inequalities' and 'abominable cruelties' that have resulted from it as it has been put in practice), none the less capitalism has worked, has, indeed, a startling triumph to its credit, which, he thinks, would have been gravely unlikely under any other system. The population of Europe, which in the beginning of the sixth century was 40,000,000, had by eighteen hundred slowly increased to 170,000,000. But in the hundred years since then it has shot up to 400,000,000. Here is a pretty problem for man's wits, to provide for this teeming increase. Yet it was done, and done successfully. But 'only the saving of surplus wealth and the application of such accumulated resources to industry can make possible the maintenance and expansion of our huge modern civilizations.' Everything indeed was hopeful. 'Britain, whose population was trebled during that period, saw a concomitant rise in the general standard of life. Two-thirds of the nation was pulled safely over the poverty line; the prosperity of the remaining third within a generation seemed assured; and the devotion of national wealth to new social services pointed to the proximity of the Promised Land.' That is no bad record, and it should be remembered. But the whole delicate structure of society was built up on the interdependence of the nations on each other; in that lay our danger but also our hope. And now a mad spirit of nationalism seems to have pulled the whole thing down about our ears. There are other reasons for it doubtless, more or less. These are given with fullness and interest in the chapter headed 'National Diagnosis,' which deals skilfully, as well as frankly and fearlessly, with many of the pressing problems of the time. But this is no local sore, as impressive figures of unemployment in the various countries eloquently prove; but we are faced by 'a sick civilization,' and the main cause of that is nationalism. 'Such are the main aspects of the world's present sickness. A war inspired by mad nationalism has slashed and mangled the delicate economic system by which modern civilization was sustained. A peace dictated by mad nationalism has infected the wounds and prevented all healing. And currency disorders, sprung voluntarily and involuntarily from mad nationalistic policy, are driving the patient crazy.' He admits frankly that there is such a thing as a sane nationalism which must be taken into account. But he appears to find even it a bothersome nuisance in an orderly world. Thus he laments the break up of Austria, that most unnatural and forced of conglomerations. 'In the case of the old Habsburg Empire we have an economic unit slashed to pieces in the supposed interests of nationalism.' That that empire was built up on, and maintained by, the grimmest of injustice and the throttling of the soul of several nations he grants, yet it moves him very little. For through that the great gross body of humanity was more easily fed. And that, it seems, is the main point; the dreams,

the visions, the passion for liberty leave him strangely cold. Sir William Wallace, one feels, is in his mind nothing but a rank bad economist, upsetting with his own form of 'mad nationalism' the economic calm: yet Scotsmen by the myriad have stood where he was done to death with their souls suddenly grown bigger, vowing to God that they must try to prove not quite unworthy of so huge a sacrifice, and thanking Him that, if through their ancestors' long struggle they come from a poor country, they are free. Nationalism is not always mad, and there is much more to be said for it than our author allows. Yet with his central thesis every Christian man must surely be in full agreement. For if the times have taught us anything, is it not that we are all members of one body, and that if any of us suffer we all suffer, and that we must play into each other's hands if the world's ailments are ever to be healed? For the rest, Mr. Kirkconnell is not without hope, and in a chapter on 'Therapeutic Principles' there are stray gleams of light: but he is very pessimistic. Not surely without grave facts, skilfully handled, to explain his mood. In the Paris of the Revolution, so he says, 4000 heads fell, but in the Russia of the Soviet there 'were officially murdered between November 1917 and November 1921 a total of 1,766,118 persons.' The book really grows gloomier as it proceeds, and ends with a grim chapter upon 'Cerebral Decay.' The author is convinced that already the Germans have paid much more than could reasonably be asked from them, and he pursues the French with a white heat of enmity that seems unintelligent. There is an irritating preface which one can skip.

Transaction of Business in the East.

'In the Patriarchal age payments were made by weight in gold, silver, and, occasionally, copper. Thus Abraham "weighed to Ephron the silver, which he had named in the audience of the children of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant" (Gen. 23^{16}). When Jacob's sons went down into Egypt to buy corn they took their money bound up in bundles, and this, when restored to them, was found to be full weight (see Gen. 43^{21}). Silver predominated, as shown by the constant use in Hebrew literature of the word "silver" (*keseph*) in the sense of "money."

'In the bill of sale of the Cave of Machpelah there is mentioned "the field, and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, that were in all the border thereof round about it." This is in keeping with modern Oriental custom, for the Arabs when buying and selling land are most particular to specify in the purchase deed everything that is on the land, otherwise anything omitted is not included in the sale. It is a common thing, *e.g.*, in the East for a man to own a well in a field, while the field itself belongs to some one else.

'At first Ephron, the owner of the Cave, offered it to Abraham for nothing. So did Ornan offer his threshing-floor to David for nothing (1 Chron. 21^{18-25}), and so did the water-seller in the days of Isaiah cry, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price" (Is. 55^{1}). Similar offers are made every day in the East in the course of business. They are a form of etiquette, the beginning of an exchange of compliments which are so often the prelude to a heated negotiation. "What is that between me and thee?" concludes the Hittite when the price is arranged, the phrase reminding one of the philosophic acquiescence into which the Oriental lapses the moment the price is fixed between the contracting parties.'[1]

Psychology and Religion.

'According to some recent thinkers, the individual is an unreal abstraction. What he calls his private judgment is the emergence in him of some stream of psychical tendency determined by his heredity and experience. The beliefs of men and their corresponding customs are the results of the history of the race. The dominant element is the inherited instinct of the herd, operating subconsciously, and mainly through imagination. The reason and judgment of the individual are really illusory.

'Theories of this kind are essentially destructive of all religion. They deny personality in any sense which secures for man a spiritual existence of his own and a hope for the future. But, imperfectly grasped, they also supply an apparent justification of those doctrines which have enjoyed a certain popularity in their affirmation of the total subordination of the individual conscience to the mind of the community. To all such theories there is a very plain answer. Whether human belief comes ultimately from the convictions of the individual or from the instinct of the herd is a matter of no consequence from the point of view of our search for truth, because every advance in knowledge, every step in the subduing of natural forces to the uses of human life, every upward movement in civilization, has been due to the thought and labour of the individual. Each little advance in science takes place because some one human being has arrived at some fresh thought, has discerned its application to some fact in his experience, and has tested it by actual trial. If he finds it to work successfully in trial after trial, he at last becomes convinced of its

[1] C. W. Budden and E. Hastings, *The Local Colour of the Bible*, i. 32 (T. & T. Clark).

truth, then conveys his discovery to others, and an addition is made to the whole of human knowledge.

'. . . That there are instincts of the herd which well up in the sub-consciousness of the individual no one need care to deny, but it is the use by the individual of his conscious and volitional powers which restrains these instincts, modifies, and directs them. Apart from the mind and judgment of the individual, man would be no higher in the scale than the bee or the ant. It is in the initiative of the individual that there resides the originating force which is continually breaking into the realm of the unknown and subduing new territories for the empire of the human spirit.' [1]

Mostly Fools.

'As a rule, people are stupid. . . . Of the sixteen hundred millions of human beings who people our planet . . . the number of those who study and personally investigate science may perhaps be estimated at fifty thousand on the whole globe, of whom six thousand are in France.' [2]

Conversion and Suggestion.

'There is not the least doubt that the presence of a large number of human beings brought together in one place may "produce certain physical effects," as Professor Granger says, "among which is a certain tendency to receive suggestions. . . . The methods of the revivalist are calculated to throw the soul off its balance and to seize it in its moment of humiliating weakness." We admit that this may be true of a certain type of revival meetings. And we are just as sure that we might apply it to some types of political meetings, at which, for Party purposes, the feelings of the audience were deeply stirred and traded on. All kinds of orators will occasionally forget themselves, and will exploit the mass-feeling for their own ends. This is not confined to religious assemblies. The right or the wrong use of it depends entirely on the motive that actuates.

'One can never escape social contagion. A multitude always moves us. We know the excitement of the crowd just as well in a large theatre or a massed political meeting or at a crowded University Rectorial Election, as in a religious service. Even the tone of society in a large drawing-room may be full of hypnotic suggestions. I do not think I ever went to London without being conscious of the literary contagion that meets one in Fleet Street or Paternoster Row or in West End Literary Clubs. There is a contagion in the lakes of Westmorland and the hills of Braemar. The atmosphere there is full of suggestions of a very elevating kind. When therefore the critic says that spiritual excitement takes pathological forms in the crowd and is the product of an emotional atmosphere, the retort is simple. His own spiritual coldness may in the same manner be produced by hypnotic suggestions of the rationalistic society in which he lives. He may breathe it in from the atmosphere of crude hedonism with which he is in daily contact. He may be guilty of the very sin which he sees in others.' [3]

Great Hymns.

'Quite a number of our well-known hymns had their origin in the curious device of a famous Nonconformist minister, some two centuries ago, for riveting the lessons of his sermon on the minds of his congregation. These lessons he put together in the form of a hymn, and at the end of his sermon made his congregation sing it.

'Hymn books were unknown in those days, nor could many of his hearers have read them had they possessed them; he therefore gave out his hymn, line by line, each line being sung as he announced it. But one member of his congregation, who could both read and write, used to copy down these hymns as Philip Doddridge recited them from the pulpit, and thus they were preserved for the use of countless thousands of worshippers in after years.

'Let us in thought join Doddridge's congregation one Sunday morning in his chapel at Northampton. He reads a lesson from St. Luke xii. 35–38, and then proceeds to impress upon his hearers the solemn and striking teaching of this wonderful passage. It is *they* who are the servants of the Lord Christ, expectant of His Second Advent, and with lighted lamps and girded loins watching for His Coming, which even then for them was close at hand. Let each one be ready for that hour. . . . And then, line by line, the now well-known words are sung for the first time:

> Ye servants of the Lord,
> Each in his office wait,
> Observant of His heavenly word,
> And watchful at His gate.'

The above is taken from *Great Hymns and their Stories*, by the Rev. W. J. Limmer Sheppard, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Ripon. The book is published at 3s. 6d. net by the Religious Tract Society.

Is the book as accurate as it is interesting?

[1] C. F. D'Arcy, in *Anglican Essays*, 36.

[2] Camille Flammarion, *Avant la Mort*, quoted in P. Heuzé, *Do the Dead Live?* 52.

[3] W. S. Bruce, *The Psychology of Christian Life and Behaviour*, 119 (T. & T. Clark).

Writing on the familiar hymn whose opening lines are :

Our blest Redeemer, ere He breathed
His tender last farewell,

the author says : 'Miss Harriet Auber wrote one verse which appears in no hymn book at the present day, viz. :

He came in tongues of living flame
To teach, convince, subdue ;
All-powerful as the wind He came,
As viewless too.'

But this verse is found at least in 'The Church Hymnary'—used by Presbyterian Churches, and 'The Congregational Hymnary' and 'Worship Song'—used by Congregational Churches. The note on this verse in Julian's 'Hymnology' is : 'In most hymnals it is given in an abbreviated form, and sometimes with a doxology (not in the original), as in Thring's *Coll.*, 1882. Orig. Text in *Hy. Comp.*, st. i., ii., iv., v., vi., vii., with 1. 4, st. vii., changed from "And worthier Thee." The omitted st. iii. is :—

He came in tongues of living flame
To teach, convince, subdue,
All powerful as the wind He came
As viewless too.'

NEW POETRY.

Poems of Hope and Vision is the title of a small book of religious poetry by the Rev. Frederic Mann, M.A. (Stockwell ; 3s. 6d. net).

The poems, which breathe a sincere and reverent religious feeling, are mainly on two themes—God's revelation of Himself through Christ and the response to that revelation in our human experience. Along with these we have a number of 'Sonnets,' though they are not all in strict sonnet form. But the author handles his medium well. Take, for example, this verse from a poem which we should like to be able to quote fully :

I muse upon the eternal way
And strive with one o'er-mastering thought,
The warp and woof of man's small day
From threads of God's vast loom are wrought,
His will is moving through the whole,
His way is in the soul.

There is, however, a shorter poem which does equal justice to the author :

God Revealed.

While age-long pains of the world increase,
And half-told hopes break off with a sigh,
God's angels are heard in carols of peace,
And God—in an Infant's cry.

The trouble of hearts that sorrow alone,
Is hushed by that answering cry divine.
The weakness and grief He makes His own,
His infinite glory thine !

The wistful sigh of the world's long pain,
No Christmas carolling yet has stilled,
But the angels ever prolong the strain
Of a joy to be fulfilled.

And louder and clearer the angels sing,
As our human weakness cries in fear,
For Love is disclosing the way to bring
That richer fulfilment near.

The Eternal Word in an Infant's cry !
Long dawn preparing the grander day,
Through trouble a deeper peace brought nigh—
This is Love's profounder way.

A. G. McL. Pearce Higgins.

A small volume of *Lyrics*, by A. G. McL. Pearce Higgins, has just been published by Mr. Basil Blackwell (2s. net). Looking at the page of contents we are struck by the familiarity of most of the titles which prepares us for a lack of originality in the lyrics themselves. This is most noticeable in the longer lyrics. At the same time they show feeling and considerable grace of expression. We quote :

Hide-and-Seek.

I walked along the road a little way
With you, and in a field we stopped to play
At hide-and-seek. I heard you cross the stile
Into the other field, and stayed awhile
Till you were ready, waiting for your shout
That never came. I rose and roamed about,
Thinking I had not heard. I called your name,
But some one else had shared our pleasant game ;
For Death unbidden kissed you on the face,
And bade you leave your sheltered hiding place.
Will no one bid me seek again and find,
Show me the place, and tell me I was blind ;
That you were waiting where I could not see,
And to my deaf ears called aloud for me ?

Yet onwards as upon the road I pass
I still expect to see you from the grass
Rise up to greet me, saying with a smile :
'How blind you are ! I was here all the while.'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Mr. F. R. Barry, M.A., D.S.O., Principal of the Ordination Test School, Knutsford, has written a remarkable little book on the Epistle to the Ephesians—*St. Paul and Social Psychology* (Milford; 4s. net). It is not a commentary in the narrow sense or an exposition in the homiletic sense. He calls it an 'Introduction' and a 'line of approach' to Ephesians. But it is far more than that. It is a study of the outstanding regulative thoughts of the Epistle in their application to the civilization of to-day. The book is remarkable for its intellectual strength and for its penetrative suggestiveness.

The key to the Epistle is the idea of Fellowship. The purpose that controls the world is a Will to fellowship. And the ground of this is to be found in the nature of God. God wills fellowship because ultimately fellowship is the life of God. 'I bow my knees to the Father, from whom every family derives.' The explanation of human society is to be sought in a higher Order. It is the manifestation of God's life in the relationships of finite spirits. Christianity denies that civilization can be built upon a merely natural foundation because the power of living together is something which only the Spirit of God makes possible.

Any sound philosophy of the State will find the real ground of society in the social character of personality. But we cannot stop there. Just in so far as human personality is the expression of the Divine Spirit, so far the social nature of personality has its roots in the social nature of God.

Just here Christianity comes into opposition with a tendency in the modern world which operates with what is called 'the gregarious instinct.' It is taken for granted that this instinct will gradually widen in its operation till it passes from nationalism to internationalism. But this is a fallacy. History does not lend any countenance to it, nor does common experience.

As a matter of fact this instinct works often for evil. It is the foe of originality. It makes for reaction. Resistance to any form of new ideas is a marked feature of all human 'herds.' Besides, the crude operation of this instinct divides rather than unites men. It organizes groups which display intense hostility to one another. When it is left to itself its automatic operation proves rather a foe to progress than an ally. Indeed it may be mentioned that what Christian thought calls 'fellowship' and what psychology calls 'group-loyalty' are at bottom incompatible terms. No addition of particulars can ever result in a universal.

This is true even of the Church. The times when the Church has been most strongly actuated by group-loyalty have not been those in which the

Spirit of Christ has been conspicuously present in her. The distinction between group-loyalty and fellowship is at bottom the distinction between proselytizing and evangelization. Christian fellowship starts not with the thought of local groups, adding them together into a world-group, but with God, whose life is perfect fellowship, manifesting Himself in and through all the relationships of human fellowship.

The natural basis of each is the same. Fellowship no less than group-loyalty operates in and through the herd-instinct. Nor need we deny that God is at work in the tendency to associate which runs through progressive life on the natural level. But instinct leads man home to God just in proportion as it is 'sublimated' in spiritual satisfaction. So we should say that what makes Fellowship is man's innate social disposition when it is consciously evoked in response to a conscious recognition of God.

It is clear then that, so far from the operation of the social instinct resulting necessarily in wider fellowship, in point of fact it often cuts directly across it. Jesus broke the ties of mere gregariousness (as expressed in caste, sectarianism, etc.) in order that Fellowship might become possible. Churches and the clerical profession need to be on their guard lest they should dignify as Christian Fellowship actions and attitudes to which psychology would give another and less complimentary name. It is clear, also, why the unity of the Church is necessarily a unity in variety. It is the outcome of a supernatural life in which all its members share, but appropriated in different ways and organized according to time, temperament, and opinion.

The title of Mr. Berry's new volume of sermons is *Revealing Light*. He says in his preface to it that the aim which underlies all the addresses is 'to show something of what the Christian revelation means in relation to the great historic facts of the Faith, and the response which those facts must awaken in the minds and hearts of men to-day.'

It is a great aim. And the degree of attainment is great. The addresses cannot be too widely read, and fortunately the volume is published by Messrs. Nisbet at a price which brings them within the reach of most of us (5s. net).

In one of the addresses Mr. Berry deals with ways of losing Christ. He sees that there are two ways. Christ may be lost 'among the humanities.' It is the way in which we are most likely to lose Him to-day. We idealize Him 'as a figure among His fellows,' but lose all grasp of Him as 'a living presence.' We 'see the breadth of His human sympathies, our hearts respond at once to that part of the story, but for the rest we are not sure that we can turn with any confidence to Him to-day. Instead of being lost in the machinery of a theological scheme, He is lost in centuries old, and our modern cry is that of Palgrave's verse:

> Comes faint and far Thy voice
> From vales of Galilee,
> Thy vision fades in ancient shades,
> How can we follow Thee?'

But there is another way in which Christ may be lost. He may be lost 'among the divinities.' There is a tendency so to lose Him to-day, and He has been lost in this way in history not once only.

What does it mean when we say that Christ is lost among the divinities? It means that the sense of human value is lost. 'Christ is shorn of all the qualities which made Him what He was. He is a theological figment in the centre of a vast scheme, splendid perhaps, but not recognizable as having any relationship with the Christ of Nazareth and Galilee. The sense of His human nearness vanishes, and for an answer to that side of human need men turn from Christ to the Virgin and to the saints.'

Mr. Berry has a message both for those who lose Christ among the divinities and for those who lose

Him among the humanities. It is the Gospel of the Connections.

He finds the Gospel of the Connections in the two passages which mark the beginning and the end of the story which the New Testament has to tell about Jesus. The passages are Luke 2^{7} and Revelation $1^{14.15}$. 'And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn': 'His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters.'

The note of the first passage is the human one. The picture conveys all the romance of the Christmas spirit. For centuries the imagination of the world has played about that manger. Around that theme all our carols have been written, artists have dwelt upon the scene, and legend has surrounded it. There is a creed in the carols and poems, but the creed is in the background. 'The note of our carols and poems is the human note, the picture of weakness and helplessness, the conditions of our human lot, the strange romance of it, the mysterious blendings, the beauty which is always near to the elemental facts of life. Then as the story continues the same thing is true, the facts are near enough to our experience—the growing boy, the first conflict between independence and parental wishes, the carpenter's shop, the slow way in which knowledge accumulates and truth is learned.'

There is a world of difference when we turn to the second passage. No longer a child of Bethlehem but a mystic figure standing among golden candlesticks with hair as white as snow and feet like burnished brass and eyes of fire and a voice like the music of falling waters. No longer human weakness but a power Divine.

But however different they may be, there is a similarity between these two passages; both have the spirit of poetry in them. Do not imagine, Mr. Berry says, that the latter passage is to be read too literally. 'Every feature in the wonderful description is closely related to some discovery which men made about Jesus as they walked the earth in His company. Just as in the simple story of the early days there is a great divine background, so in these later ideas which sometimes seem remote from the Jesus of the Gospels there is a human background. Does not the hair white as snow express men's feeling that Jesus cannot be understood unless the mind goes very far back in time? Are not the feet of fine brass a symbol of the tireless and swift journeyings of love which Jesus took at the bidding of human need? Are not the eyes like a flame of fire, pictured memories of a look which was sometimes like a tender light and sometimes like a blaze, and the voice like the sound of many waters, the recalled music of His speech?'

But not only is there a spirit of similarity between the passages. They are linked together in fact. Men's minds did travel this distance in relation to Jesus. Some who were already living when He was born did, before they died, think about Him after the manner of this Book of the Revelation.

And Mr. Berry is convinced of the importance to-day of keeping the connection between the lowly beginning and the lofty climax. 'When we are thinking of the human life, of the way in which Christ came into the world, and of the unfolding incidents of His youth and His later ministry, we only see it partially and imperfectly unless there is somewhere in our minds a sense of the divine meaning of it—that these facts do not merely form one little isolated romance of beauty, but that they spring out of the purpose and the love of God, and breathe a note which is as true to-day as when the stars looked down on the fields of Bethlehem. The reverse is just as true. When we have before our minds these pictures of a Christ who is enthroned in heaven, majestic and awful, the Saviour and the Judge of men, we are set upon false tracks at once, unless all the time we see the

connexion between those pictures and the human story. The images may be different but Christ does not change with our changing thoughts, and He is the same whether earth or heaven be the stage He walks.'

'The whole spirit and inspiration of our faith depends upon making the connexion, so that we neither lose Christ amid the clouds nor among the centuries, but on the firm basis of history build our confidence that Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, and today, and for ever."'

The current number of *The London Quarterly Review* contains an interesting study of the social teaching of Jesus and of the Apostolic Church by the Rev. Wilbert F. Howard, M.A., B.D., which marks a reaction from the over-emphasis which it has been common to lay upon that element in New Testament teaching. The writer begins with a *caveat*. It might seem a simple matter to summarize the recorded sayings of Jesus on wealth and poverty and on the relation of the individual to the social fabric, and then to go on to discover how far, in actual practice, the Master's precepts were applied to the various conditions of life throughout the Græco-Roman world in which the Apostolic Church worked.

There are two difficulties in the way, however. There is a literary difficulty: How far has editorial interpretation modified the transmitted oral tradition? And there is an historical difficulty: What was the actual background of social conditions presupposed by any given passage cited in the New Testament?

An illustration will serve to show how these two difficulties sometimes merge into one problem. It will also reveal something of the true mind of Jesus on social duty. The Beatitudes are given in two of the Gospels. But whereas in Matthew poverty is poverty of spirit and hunger and thirst are for righteousness, in Luke the terms are literal and practical. A comparison of the Gospels has led most students to the conclusion that, as a rule, Luke holds most closely to the words of his sources, while Matthew exercises considerable freedom of interpretation. Matthew's tendency is to heighten the colour or to give a specific application to the sayings of our Lord. There is reason to think that we have here an example of these tendencies.

But the question arises: Was Matthew entitled to interpret the words in that way? This question carries us from the literary aspect of the problem to the historical. Who were 'the poor'? The history of the word is this. At first it meant needy. In the time of the prophets it meant those who suffered oppression at the hands of a cruel aristocracy. With the Exile it came to describe suffering Israel regarded as ideally righteous. Then, as time went on, probably because piety was to be found much more among the humbler classes than among the wealthy, the word received a religious colouring, and in the later period it stood for the faithful and God-fearing Jews in contrast with the worldly and indifferent majority who were ready to accept pagan innovations.

'The social and religious persecution of the poor, in the sense of the pious, is one of the most clearly marked features of the later Psalms, so that when Jesus came to announce the kingdom of heaven there was a class of people ready for His message. They were all potential disciples. Their thoughts were not preoccupied with worldly ambitions. . . . "Matthew" is therefore right in recognizing that Jesus is not prescribing a *minus* property qualification, but is making His appeal to those whose spiritual temper is congenial to that Kingdom which is not of this world.'

It is true that the teaching of Jesus is closely related to the background of life in His time, in which wealth and poverty were present side by side. But, generally speaking, Jesus had little to say about the conditions of life in themselves. It is

the purely personal question of spiritual efficiency that lies behind His warnings against wealth. This was the case, *e.g.*, in such incidents as the Rich Fool, Dives and Lazarus, and the Young Ruler. What damns Dives is not his wealth but his loveлessness. It was equally the case in the Cleansing of the Temple.

Jesus was not an economist laying down laws which, if applicable to the simple conditions of His own time, would be irrelevant to the vastly more complex commercial situation with which we have to deal. And the same may be said of the Apostolic Church. The great achievement of the Church in that age was the creation of a Christian conscience. It taught the supreme value of the human personality. The brother for whom Christ died has first claim, before any convenience or advantage of our own. This is the truth which lies at the heart of the Christian Revolution.

The problem of evil is of perennial interest, if anything that is so painful can rightly be said to be 'interesting.' Over it thinking men of all ages have racked their brains and well-nigh broken their hearts. *Unde malum?* is the question which many systems of thought, some of them apparently fantastic enough—witness Gnosticism—have been constructed to answer. *Unde?* you may set aside if you will. *Quare?* however, will not be dismissed. No man can have any reasoned view of God, man, or the world, and ignore this *why? or to what end?*

Answers have often been attempted. Probably no new answer can be suggested. Old answers, however, admit of being re-stated. Every new statement is worth consideration, for this age-old problem comes home with all the startling force of novelty in the experience of every generation and of most individuals.

A brief but noteworthy treatment of the subject will be found in *The Personalist* for April from the pen of the Editor. Mr. Flewelling's solution is clearly enough indicated in the title of the article, 'Schoolmaster Pain.' Only he does not limit himself to that one aspect of the problem. Error, pain, and moral evil are, as he points out, the three forms which the question assumes, and on each he has wise and weighty words to say.

Error, he points out—and it is well worth pointing out—is the rock on which all materialistic epistemologies are shattered. If, as the realists tell us, things really are just as they appear to be; if, as naturalism holds, the mind is simply a mirror of external facts, then there can be no such thing as error—*Quod est absurdum.* That error proves a good schoolmaster needs no demonstration. 'Mankind would seem to owe its mental equipment very largely to the possibility of error.'

'As the possibility of error is the source of man's mental activity, the possibility of pain is fundamental to his physical and social well-being. . . . If physical violence were unattended by pain, we should most of us go through life maimed and deformed by acts done in ignorance and before our minds had arrived at the possibility of knowledge. Nerves are absolutely necessary to save us from self-destruction. The possibility of pain is thus seen to be necessary to physical existence. Has it any effect of a social nature?'

'Here we hit upon a use of pain which goes outside of individual well-being into the wider reaches of social welfare. The recognition of the possibility of pain is one of the strongest impulses making for social welfare. Any teaching that pain is an unreality is fundamentally anti-social. Out of the possibility of pain have grown the ameliorative agencies of society, and the successive stages of civilization may be marked exactly by growth in these agencies. It is moral sensitiveness to pain in others that has abolished slavery and ended peonage and led the path of every social reform.'

As to moral evil our author takes practically the line which is adopted in the art. 'Good and Evil'

in the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. He distinguishes between evil action and the possibility of evil. While the latter is a necessity for moral life, the former is not. 'We need not "sin that grace may abound." It is quite sufficient evidence of grace and of character that the sin is not entered into. One is quite as much saved from sins never committed as from those once actually entered into.' 'Out of temptation we can gather to ourselves the moral power of continuously right decisions; and when all men have truly learned that lesson we shall have a heavenly society not because from us has been taken away the possibility, but we have conquered the will to sin.'

'Just why error, pain and evil should have been permitted, we do not know and cannot say. But it may be that to God the final mental, social and moral outcome was worth the venture, and to His eye there may be a goal far off of such supreme worth for every son of man as to far outweigh every distress. It is the part of religion to live as if this were true.'

Sin, Hell, and Salvation.

By William E. Wilson, B.D., Professor of New Testament Theology and Christian Ethics in the Selly Oak Colleges.

A few years ago the saying was often quoted with satisfaction that the modern man is not 'worrying' about his sins, but is actively engaged in trying to make the world better. If the emphasis had been on the word 'worrying,' and the saying had meant that the modern man had resolutely turned from his sins and was seeking a new life of righteousness relying on God's forgiveness, there would be nothing to criticize in the quotation. Unfortunately, it is pretty certain that this was not its meaning. The thought rather was that 'sin' was an out-of-date category and that, by earnest endeavour to set circumstances (and other people) right, each man would be doing his part towards making a happy world. The war and the so-called peace which has followed it show that the modern man has not achieved success, and at any rate convey the suggestion that perhaps in disregarding his own sin he made a cardinal error.

No doubt he had excuse. The doctrine of sin has often been stated in forms that seem unreal. But the fact of sin cannot be denied and is overlooked only at great peril. It is therefore important for us to seek the truth about sin, its consequences and the possibilities of its removal. That is the subject of this essay, which is intended rather to suggest a method of approach and a line of treatment that may appeal to people at the present day, than to be a systematic treatment of so great a subject.

If any one looks at the ills that life has brought him, he will certainly acknowledge that a large proportion of them could have been avoided by more understanding, foresight, or goodwill on his own part or on the part of other people. Some may have been directly caused by his own misdeeds. He may, for example, have injured his health by excess. Others may have been caused by the misdeeds of other people. He may have been robbed, cheated, or his character defamed. Others, again, have been due to accident, carelessness, or lack of easily attainable knowledge. A careless person throws orange peel on the pavement. Some one slips and breaks his leg. Some one's incompetence or negligence brings to others great business embarrassments. The folly, ambition, and untruthfulness of statesmen involve the world in war, and the innocent suffer all the world over. As the last instance shows, it is not only individuals who thus suffer from the misdoings of themselves and others, the whole world suffers. In fact, the world of mankind is like a vast and complicated machine, which if kept properly in order is quite capable of providing the material, and much of the spiritual, basis of a good and happy life for all men. If, however, as the Americans put it, 'some one throws a monkey-

clutch into the machinery,' it naturally works all wrong, and of course brings distress and misery to some one, sometimes to many. The onlooker can tell that some one has done wrong, *because* the machine works wrong.

Our first point, then, is this: An enormous proportion of misery and evil in the world is directly traceable to human agency. The actions, thoughts (or lack of them), and passions of men are condemned as evil because, and in so far as, they throw the world out of gear and produce distress instead of happiness.

This gives us a suggestion towards the framing of our standard of right and wrong. Emotions, thoughts, and actions which make for the harmonious development of mankind in love and unity are right. They work towards good. Those that make for discord and degeneration are wrong. They work towards evil. Are, then, all these evil acts, passions, thoughts, and desires sin? No, the term 'sin' is reserved for evil which the doer himself recognizes to be evil. A man is a sinner who accepts a certain moral standard and then acts out of accord with it.

Our second point, then, is a first preliminary definition of sin: Sin is knowing the better and choosing the worse.

We may now with advantage inquire what are the consequences of sin? The first and most obvious answer to this follows from what has already been said. Seeing that we recognize wrong-doing by the fact that it produces evil results, it follows that one necessary consequence of sin is harm to some one. It may be to the doer. It is very often to other people. The material and most obvious wrong done by the robber, murderer, adulterer, exploiter, profiteer, liar, dishonest politician, war-maker, or other evil-doer is not in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred done to himself; it is done to others. Roughly speaking, it is only by vice and sensual excess that the doer physically harms himself more than others. It is, however, to be noted that the physical harm done is just as great when the act is not recognized to be sin as when it is. The political assassin does as much, or more, harm than the murderer, but he thinks he does right; and the profiteer, exploiter, lying politician, and war-maker scarcely even realize that they have done wrong. Their methods are to them necessary and therefore right, but their results to the world generally are often terribly evil.

Two conclusions of some importance arise from these considerations: (*a*) It is not enough that men act according to the dictates of conscience. Conscience itself needs educating by careful consideration of the facts of life and of the ideal which we ought to set before us. (*b*) The recognition that something hitherto done innocently is wrong, is an important step in the advance to better things.

This leads us on to another question. In what way, if at all, are the consequences of sin (*i.e.* conscious wrong-doing) worse than the consequences of innocent wrong-doing? The answer is that sin (conscious wrong-doing) always produces spiritual degeneration in the doer. His character deteriorates. Not only does the sinner cease to be a free-man by becoming the slave of habit, but also his power of judging between right and wrong, his strength of mind and his will become weakened. A vivid presentation of the gradual deterioration that thus sets in is given by St. Paul in Ro 1. He points out how stage by stage the heathen world, sinning against the light, became hopelessly corrupt, so that at the end it attained the 'reprobate mind,' that is, a mind incapable of right judgment. To that consequence sin must obviously lead in the end, if nothing intervenes to prevent it. The Apostle was clearly not exaggerating when he said 'The end of those things is death,'[1] for the logical conclusion of an unhindered continuance in sin would appear necessarily to be complete destruction of body and soul.[2]

Our third point therefore is: The Wages of sin is death.

It will be seen that this is leading straight to something like a doctrine of Hell. Sin breeds sin; evil breeds evil. Men come to hate and injure one another more and more. They make Hell for themselves and others, until they destroy themselves and others. Is, then, the Mediæval doctrine of Hell true?—Does God condemn men to endless torment as a just reward of their misdeeds?—No. The idea of Hell which we now get is different from that in the following points:

1. It is not suffering inflicted *as an extra* by God or devil. It is simply the inevitable consequence in a causal world of wrong-doing.

2. It is not retributive in the sense usually given to that word. The frequently expressed idea that

[1] Ro 6^{21}.

[2] Unless, indeed, it be a fact that the soul is indestructible.

the moral law of the Universe requires sin to be exactly balanced by suffering, appears to have no sufficient foundation. The following considerations will make this clear: (*a*) The working of the law of cause and effect is amply sufficient to account for the suffering which is usually called retributive. (*b*) This suffering does not, as far as we can see, fall proportionately to the guilt. (*c*) It can scarcely be regarded as the outcome of Justice (in any full sense), because one of its consequences is almost always the increase of evil. This is definitely stated in the Apostle's words in Ro 1.[1] However much we might regard physical suffering as a punishment, balancing ill-deserts and producing good, it is impossible thus to regard spiritual deterioration, which ends in loss of power to distinguish between right and wrong. That is, and can be, only unmitigated evil.

3. This Hell, unlike that of Mediæval ideas, would appear not to be everlasting for any individual, but to be a painful process of physical and spiritual destruction which has as its end annihilation of personality. This is the end that seems to be contemplated in two New Testament references (2 Th 1^{9}, Mk 9^{48}).[2]

4. Until personality is extinguished, we need not suppose that these consequences of sin are absolutely irrevocable. The forces of good may surely at any time gain a foothold in the perishing personality, delay and, if successful, entirely neutralize the destructive process, finally turning the life to good and to growth instead of to evil and destruction. There does not seem to be any reason in the nature of things why the redeeming power of God should be limited to this earthly life.

Our fourth point, then, is: The law of cause and effect ensures that the consequences of evil are inevitable and terrible, so terrible as in some degree to resemble the ancient idea of Hell; but they ought not to be regarded as Divine interference in punishment, for, beside being no more than the natural result of wrong-doing, they make matters worse.

What now is the relation of sin to God? Our approach to an answer to this question is naturally through the world order. All evil-doing is a disturbance in the harmonious working of the world, but in so much as God is the founder and ruler of the world, what makes it work badly and destroys its people is obviously an attack upon Him. It is to be noted that the more we recognize God's goodness, the clearer does man's sin stand out as opposition to Him. For it opposes His aim—human good. Sin, then, is opposition to God. Not that there is in the minds of most sinners a deliberate animus against God; rather He is not in their thoughts, and His will is disregarded. Yet this fact that in sin God is disregarded brings us to the very heart of our subject. The root of sin is not hatred against God or man, nor is it outspoken revolt; it is simply absorption in the self to such an extent that neither God nor one's fellow-men enter into one's thoughts except as means to one's own ends. The typical sinner is not the blasphemer or the atheist, nor the violent and passionate man, but the selfish man. All evil that men do to one another can be traced back to self-centredness. Conscious sin is the deliberate choice of one's own way, having partly recognized, but rejected, the claims of God and man. Unconscious evil-doing does not imply a conscious rejection of God or man, but it implies such a concentration upon self that they are disregarded.

At this point it will be clear that there is often sin in unconscious wrong-doing. A man injures another without any intention of doing so, therefore there was not a sin in intention, but because it was perfectly possible for him to have known that his act would injure his fellow-man, yet he did not take the trouble to know, he sinned in not having sufficient interest in his fellow-men to study how his action affected them as well as himself. Such lack of thought for others, expressed in all sorts of regrettable actions, is common in almost every one, and is directly responsible for a great deal of human misery. On reflexion it will be realized that it is sin of this sort that is a chief cause of the great blots on our civilization. It is at the root of our social problem. It makes our international problem. It is the sin of which we all are guilty, and of which we all need to repent.

Our fifth point is that Sin is a refusal to recognize God, one's fellow-men, and God's world purpose. Sin is selfishness.

God is not merely the moral governor of the Universe, but the loving Father who delights in people and desires their friendship. The revelation of God in Jesus Christ, in so far as it can be expressed in words, is most adequately summed up in the words 'God is Love.' His purpose is not some self-glorification or self-aggrandisement, for He was

[1] See especially vv.[28-32].

[2] See Swete's *St. Mark, in loc.*

completely represented in human life by One who impressed people by His humility, and who died to bring men to their true life. His purpose for mankind is a common good, in which all shall share, based upon love to Him, and binding man to man in love, fellowship, and service. When a man opposes God, he opposes no selfish potentate, but one whose object is his welfare and who seeks for his friendship. Sin, then, is not only opposition against God, which carries with it opposition against one's fellow-men, but opposition against one's own true interests. It is a narrowing of self, a concentration of self upon self, which inevitably leads to a sort of drying up of the personality.

Our sixth point, then, is that man's sin is such a misconception of himself and God that he thinks satisfaction in life is to be gained within himself instead of seeking it in union with God, which implies union with his fellow-men.

It now remains to ask what is the cure of sin? The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the proclamation of the cure of sin and of the way to the supremacy of God in the world. The cure is complete and fundamental. It puts men right where they first went wrong. The source of wrong was selfishness—finding the centre of each life in itself. The cure is the replacing of selfishness by love and the centring of each life in God. Jesus Christ shows us God winning men by loving them. When a man sees that God's will is his perfect development and perfect happiness in union with his fellow-men and in the love of God; when he sees that God loves him and means well by him, he must respond by letting his selfishness break down into love, by loving God and desiring to do His will. As a man thus responds to God, he is being saved. The root cause of his sin is done away. His will and affections are captured. His conduct may, it is true, still be far from right, but its ultimate reformation is secured. For every outward act of sin is the expression of an inner source of evil and is to be set right through the cleansing of that inner source by the power of Divine Love.

This is the true meaning of the Pauline Doctrine of Justification by Faith. The justified man is neither made just, in the sense of becoming on conversion perfectly good, nor is he merely reckoned to be just, while he is in reality no such thing. Both these ideas err in viewing the matter externally and statically. What happens is internal and dynamic. The seed of creative good is implanted in the life of the justified, and that is a growing thing with a power of expansion and the promise of perfection within itself. Yet even that expression is metaphorical and omits part of the truth. A truer statement is that the justified is one who has come into the living friendship of God through Christ, which exerts a transforming power upon him, the end of which is perfection of character. This begins within in the roots of life. It alters affections, aims, and motives. It removes sin and produces virtue, yet its method of doing so is not by obedience to external law, but by the energy of a living power within, the Holy Spirit, which thus expresses itself in character and conduct.

When once it is grasped that the overcoming of sin and the cultivation of virtue are inward and vital, rather than external and legal matters, an inference of the utmost practical importance can be drawn. Particular sins and temptations are not to be conquered by the outward method of sorrow for sin and struggle against it; but by turning from it, seeking fuller communion with God, and so putting oneself into the sphere in which 'the power of God' works 'unto salvation in every one that believeth.' In other words, repentance (change of mind), which was the beginning of the Christian life, is to continue throughout as its essential feature, and its method of gaining power. A constant turning from self and sin to God, and a constant communion with Him is the way of life. It is the renewing of the mind (*ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοός*) of which change of mind (*μετάνοια*) was the initial stage.

Our seventh and final point is therefore that sin, because it is selfishness, can only be overcome by love, and that love conquers it in detail as well as in general. The way of salvation is from first to last nothing but a continual response to the love of Christ, a continual walking in His companionship, and thereby a transformation of character into His likeness.

Literature.

CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

As biology dominated the nineteenth century, psychology bids fair to dominate the twentieth. It is the key that unlocks every door. Industry, education, ethics, history, medicine, and religion are all brought under the dominion of this new science. And, naturally, Christian thinkers who are in touch with current thought and sensitive to its direction are looking at the claims of the new psychology and asking questions. It is probably an exaggeration to say that psychology is 'the enemy' to-day as science was fifty years ago. But it is safe to say that the claim made by some of the leaders of the new science (such as Freud) to have explained religion away, and the grounds on which this claim is made, both stand in need of urgent and searching examination. This task has already been taken in hand by several very competent persons. Crichton Miller and Pym have both written good books on this line. There is room, however, for more books on the subject, and we offer a warm welcome to Mr. F. R. Barry's new volume, *Christianity and Psychology* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), on account both of its subject and of the ability with which it is handled.

The book is divided, really though not formally, into three parts. The first chapters contain a useful statement of the conclusions of the new psychology on three points: Instinct, the Unconscious, and Suggestion. This is familiar ground, but even one who is acquainted with the recognized authorities will enjoy this fresh presentation of the facts and the sidelights thrown on them by an independent mind. For the most part, Mr. Barry accepts the conclusions referred to—in some cases too easily, we think. But there are two important exceptions to this. He rejects decisively the belittling and degradation of reason implied in the prevailing theory of the Unconscious. But even more decisively he repudiates the way in which the human will is dethroned and pushed away into a very subordinate rôle. This part of chapter three should be read with care. To Mr. Barry the will is simply the personality in action, and purpose is of the essence of personality. The 'Law of Reversed Effort,' which exalts imagination above will, is therefore based on an error. What is wrong with men often is that the will itself is debased, and suggestion can never be sufficient in such a case. What suggestion does is to reinforce the will, and what we need when our wills are wrong is not suggestion but regeneration.

The second part of the book shows how Christianity partly anticipates and wholly satisfies the needs of the soul as psychology declares them. Jesus provides what psychology shows we need, a purpose to unify life, and a power to realize this through our faith in Himself. He points the way to that forgiveness which sets the will free, and thus enables us to 'sublimate' our instincts in the service of the kingdom of God. Moreover, in the practice of prayer we have the state of mind in which suggestions of good are 'acceptable' and powerful. And, finally, the confidence which all forms of psychotherapy demand as the condition of a return to healthy-mindedness is furnished by the person of Jesus Himself when He is regarded as Lord of the soul.

Perhaps the strongest part of Mr. Barry's book is the last section, in which he comes to close quarters with a subject already handled in an earlier chapter—the alleged subjectivity of religious experience. He points out that the new psychology makes the same mistake as physical science did in the nineteenth century. It sometimes forsakes the ground of analysis and trespasses on that of interpretation, which belongs to philosophy. Many (though not all) of the adherents of the new system roundly declare that religion is either a form of auto-suggestion or a 'projection' by the individual of his own desires or by the herd of the bond which holds it together. Mr. Barry asserts that in such theories psychology forsakes its own province. But he is not content with this criticism. He proceeds to discuss these suggestions on their merits, and his discussion, besides facing what is the most pressing philosophical problem of our day, will be found to lay down the lines of a Christian apologetic of an entirely reassuring and satisfying kind. A summary of the argument would not do it justice. We must be content to say that it points to the validity of the age-long experience of the Christian society, to the regulative value of the historic personality of Jesus, and to the metaphysical necessity of a supreme and perfect Divine person-

ality as the only possible ground of personality in man. The idea of God alone makes sense of the universe, and, in addition, this idea alone makes sense of psychology itself and its conclusions. We call attention with pleasure to this remarkable book, which is one of the most admirable essays yet published on its important subject.

A CHRISTIAN DECALOGUE.

A new book by Dr. R. F. Horton is always something of an event. Once again, in *The Mystical Quest of Christ* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), he makes straight to the heart of things, and gives us a work at once thought-provoking and spiritually moving. The name, indeed, does not seem specially apposite to the contents, nor does the explanation given remove that impression. But whatever it be called, here is an honest facing of the problems that the faith forces upon one. What is the point of Christianity? Among all the babble of doctrine and welter and confusion of talk, can we discover one rule of life on which all Christians are agreed? We can: and it proves to be bewilderingly simple, if immeasurably far-reaching and deep. The end of faith is to make us Christ-like.

There is that wonderful Figure, which modern criticism and all the fingering of the Gospels and the endless teasing at their contents have not obscured, which whoso meets, feels that he has come upon an Outer Conscience, that this is what life ought to be, and that to fall below this, to be other than this, is henceforth sin. And what is His main characteristic? It is unselfishness: it is reserving no place for Himself in His own life, it is spending it eagerly and lavishly on others. This, then, is what we have to reproduce, not in the ascetic fashion of à Kempis, but claiming the whole world for God. And Dr. Horton works this out with thoroughness in chapters on the Choice of a calling, Art, Amusement, Illness, and the like. But in the second portion of his book he takes a wider sweep. He declares that, if our law of life be applied honestly and without reservation, it must result in a second, in a Christian, Decalogue. Christ did not supersede the Ten Commandments: He amplified them, spiritualized them, pressed them home further and deeper. And it is time, thinks Dr. Horton, that something of all this should be gathered into a further code to be set alongside of the other. More than that, he attempts to draw it up. Here it is:

1. We must strive, in accordance with the will of our heavenly Father, to extend by every means possible the kingdom of Heaven on earth.

2. We must try to think of all races and nations as equally dear to God.

3. We must forgive every injury which has been done to us.

4. We must act on the teaching of the parable of the Good Samaritan, and must take seriously the precept of Jesus: 'Go thou and do likewise.'

5. As Christ for our sakes became poor, we should not estimate people by their possessions, but wholly by their character and conduct.

6. We should strive constantly to be absolutely honest in our everyday dealings, realizing that these are a very important test of our creed.

7. As Christ blessed the children, we should recognize the sacredness of child life.

8. Because Christ healed disease, we should use His power to heal disease, and should exert all our influence to secure healthy conditions of life for all.

9. Convinced that Christ came to establish peace on Earth, we should turn all our thought and influence to render war unnecessary and impossible.

10. Because we have received special talents, we should try to cultivate them and to use them in the service of Christ and His Church.

The last section of Dr. Horton's book is an attempt to answer the question, How is this Christ-likeness to be acquired? It deals in a fresh and appealing fashion with the lost art of meditation, auto-suggestion and its spiritual uses, association, and the other helps given to lift us on our way. In a moving passage he confesses that he has discovered that his besetting sin is depression. Let Dr. Horton take new courage, for he must be mastering his failing. There is not a suggestion of it here. This is the book of a young and untired spirit, eager-eyed, full of enthusiasm, and entirely sure that 'the first of the new beats the last of the old.'

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE SCHOOL.

A great deal of attention is being paid to the training of teachers, both day school and Sunday school, in order to fit them for giving religious education. For the most part this attention has

been directed to the improvement of their technical outfit; better methods of teaching, better apparatus, better grading, a better psychology, and so on. This is all to the good. The teaching in our Sunday schools has been far behind that in our day schools in efficiency, and that is a reproach to the Church. But it may be suggested that there is another direction in which training is even more urgently needed. It is necessary to deal not only with the method of teaching, but also with its religious content; in other words, not only *how* to teach but *what* to teach is one of our urgent problems.

The importance of this question is being increasingly realized. We have to mediate not only between the teacher and the expert professional, but between the teacher and the expert Biblical critic. The conclusions of criticism have been filtering down into the minds of the average person and the average teacher, often in a distorted form, and the result has often been simply a loss of confidence in the Bible without any real corresponding enlightenment. But the teacher cannot give lessons on the Bible with any heart or with any permanent result if he has lost confidence in the very book he is expounding. That is why a sound view of the authority and value of Scripture is urgently necessary.

A good many books have recently appeared that have dealt, from this point of view, with the Old Testament, notably those of Mr. Redlich and Professor McFadyen. Interest has been concentrated on the Old Testament because of its peculiar difficulties. But the New Testament has its own problems and its own needs for the teacher, and at last a book has appeared which handles these adequately. It is *The New Testament in Modern Education*, by Mr. J. Morgan Jones, M.A., Professor of Church History and Religious Education, Independent College, Bangor (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net). It is a great book. We have read it right through with increasing fascination. The standpoint is perhaps more 'critical' than that of the majority of Church people, even when their views are quite 'broad.' But the intelligent teacher can make allowance for this, and in any case he need not accept all Professor Jones' opinions. But the book as a whole and in all its parts is a real achievement, and, we should say, quite indispensable to the teacher.

It is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the relation between religious and modern education generally; and with such questions as the significance for the teacher of modern Biblical study and its results, and the educational interpretation of the New Testament. The handling of these and other general topics is in every way admirable. No teacher, however intelligent or instructed, will fail to learn a great deal from these discussions. The second part of the book passes to the treatment of specific parts of the New Testament. We have chapters on 'The Life of Jesus for Childhood,' 'The Synoptic Presentation of Christ for Adolescence,' 'Jesus Christ and the Kingdom of God.' There is a very rich chapter on 'Teaching the Parables,' and one that will raise some questioning in the teacher's mind on 'The Problem of the Miracles.' Taking the book as a whole, we should say it is one of the most valuable contributions to the literature of religious education that has appeared for a considerable time.

THE STORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Dr. Alexander Nairne, who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, has written *Every Man's Story of the Old Testament* (Mowbrays; 4s. 6d. net). The book justifies its title. It is written simply—Dr. Nairne is specially careful about this—and will be welcomed by the non-specialist reader. But it does not neglect the student. The book embodies the results of modern scholarship, not forgetting 'the master key of knowledge—reverence.'

It is the story of the Old Testament, telling, as far as possible, how, when, and under what circumstances the books were written. It is the story of the people who first possessed the Old Testament; of their experiences, their politics, their faith, and the story is told in such a way as to make it live anew. 'Treat it,' urges Dr. Nairne, 'not as a store of mechanic piety but as sacred literature, the eloquence of the Spirit of God.' And again he says, 'The Old Testament is much better than correct. The fair theology we cull from it comes all marred with antique superstitions and vestiges of human gloom. It comes too all glowing with light and warmth. For it comes as a story, vivid story of men's hope and trust, and doing and suffering, and goodness and badness, error and loyalty and affection and passion. Every several character in the drama touches our heart. The generations move onward to a goal of which they

are only in part conscious; their life itself is their appointed business. This is Israel's story, an entrancing story which he may read who runs.'

It certainly is an entrancing story as Dr. Nairne gives it to us. There is not a chapter, not a page, but is of intense interest. Throughout the book are many masterly character sketches, and there is an excellent summary of the history of Old Testament criticism in the Epilogue. Not the least valuable part of the book is the references throughout to books for further study. There is a wealth of excellent illustrations and five maps, two of the latter being sketch maps with helpful notes on the method of their production.

THE POWER WITHIN US.

The 'New Psychology' is rapidly invading all the spheres which were formerly held sacred to ethics and religion. Psycho-analysis claims not only medical but moral victories, and the school of Nancy aims at even higher flights. Messrs. Allen & Unwin, to whom we owe so many of the recent psychological studies, have just published two books which deal with the achievements and ambitions of auto-suggestion from different standpoints. *Christianity and Auto-suggestion*, by Mr. C. Harry Brooks and the Rev. Ernest Charles (3s. 6d. net), has an outlook that is entirely and warmly religious. *The Power Within Us*, by M. Charles Baudouin (3s. 6d. net), an excellent translation by E. and C. Paul of 'La Force en Nous,' sets out a scheme of life that calls for no help outside itself.

Mr. Brooks and Mr. Charles have written a book which is not only extremely interesting, but is sure to be practically helpful. They are strong adherents of M. Coué, but they are also decided Christian believers, and their aim in this exposition is to place auto-suggestion in its true position in Christian life and thought, and also to utilize the Christian dynamic for extending and deepening its power. The secular practice of auto-suggestion continues in its place, but side by side with it the authors erect a Christian practice of auto-suggestion. The first part of the book compares the Nancy method point by point with the method of Jesus, and the two are shown to be identical in essence. The points are these: (1) Whatever the disease, the method of cure is the same; (2) Faith is simply the expectancy of a cure; (3) In both methods means are taken to increase faith; (4) The healing power is a human endowment (the disciples also healed the sick); (5) Faith is as necessary in the healer or suggester as in the patient, in order to kindle faith in the patient; (6) The will is to be entirely surrendered in order to acquire power. This is a prominent feature of Jesus' teaching (and Paul's; cf. Ro 7). It is also the central point of M. Coué's method, the famous 'Law of Reversed Effort,' which runs thus: 'When the will and the imagination are antagonistic, it is always the imagination which wins without any exception.' (7) Finally the healing force is 'the power within.' According to the Nancy professor the source of power lies in the unconscious. Power courses through us. It is called by various psychologists 'mental energy,' 'élan vital,' 'libido,' 'urge.' Our authors call it the power of the immanent God, and that is where they begin to extend the meaning and scope of the Nancy formula.

This is the burden of the second part of the book. M. Coué has much on his side to give to Christianity. We learn, *e.g.*, from him how vital faith is and what powers lie in it; also, that God must have all the ways of life, physical and mental, opened to His influence. But Christianity, on its side, adds enormously to the power of auto-suggestion. It provides a basis of faith far beyond anything possible to psychological science; it opens up sources of emotion for 'sublimating' instincts not within reach of any psychological system; but, above all, by appealing to the ultimate source of power, the God who dwells within us all, instead of to a merely intermediate entity, the unconscious mind, far greater results may be expected. Consequently, while insisting on the same expectancy as M. Coué, the authors extend his formula to contain an act of faith in God. They suggest, among other alternative formulæ for the believer, this, *e.g.*: 'O God, our Father, grant that the words I am about to speak may be said in simple faith in Thee: Day by day, in every way, I am growing better and better.' But they go much further than this. They show how the same attitude may, and should, be maintained in prayer generally, supplying specimen prayers for certain common troubles. And they also show how the formula suggested and the attitude it embodies become a means of growth in grace, in holiness, and in love. The book is not a large one, but it is a valuable contribution to Christian psychology, its main idea being

simply that auto-suggestion is religion unaware of itself.

M. Baudouin's volume has its own value and interest, but in both respects it is inferior to the book just described. Passing from one to the other is like passing out of the sunshine into a rather chilly and sombre chamber. Not that the French book lacks vitality. It is extremely well written, and is full of literary references and quotations that throw light on the argument. But there is something pathetic in the spectacle of a writer setting forth a scheme of life and deliberately putting aside the deeper sources of energy and idealism. It is all interesting and even vivacious, but you never seem to have any firm ground under your feet.

M. Baudouin does a good piece of work at the outset by showing how the materialism which looked on thought as a product has given way to a more spiritual view which sees in thought an agent and in moral energy something not dependent on the physical basis. From this he goes on to an analysis of personality and of its powers with an eye always to the conduct of life. In conduct, he says, the chief factor is not will or effort but thought. Fix your attention on an idea and a result follows. 'In auto-suggestion conception is everything; realization is subconscious and effortless; the *effort* of thought must be practically *nil*.' The two modes of action are the will and auto-suggestion. In the former, the idea is predominant; in the latter, the idea is everything. The result is, we can do really anything we wish by concentration. This is the great moral achievement of the new psychology. No longer need we say 'video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor.' We attain a condition in which it is enough to see the better course in order to be able to follow it. We can do this by a concentration, which is, in effect, a kind of hypnotism. Of course we need *confidence*, confidence in ourselves, and (even more) in life and in the world. 'But,' says M. Baudouin airily, 'science furnishes ample justification for such confidence.' When we examine the proofs which science offers for such confidence, however, we do not easily share M. Baudouin's optimism. And indeed a few lines further on he confesses that this confidence is a leap in the dark. 'It is not a logical inference, but a joyous abandonment, the light-hearted boldness of one deciding to make a brisk advance towards life. It is certainly an act of the emotions rather than of the intellect.' And that is pretty much all. M. Baudouin has many interesting things to say about perseverance and courage and effort and other admirable virtues. But 'the power within' is one with a small 'p,' and that is what we feel all through.

EGYPT AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

'The results of this investigation are disappointingly negative.' This sentence, which has reference to a single chapter of *Egypt and the Old Testament*, by Professor T. Eric Peet, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), might serve for the whole book. For this the author is not to be held responsible, for it must be recognized that 'at every point we are baulked by lack of sufficient information.' Moreover, he is a victim to the zeal of previous investigators, who have attempted to prove too much. His criticism in respect of this is directed mainly against Petrie and Naville (Hall twice). He follows Gardiner in placing Raamses at Avaris (Pelusium), and Pithom he locates 8½ m. further west, at Petrie's Raamses (or Rameses). In the last chapter the identification Tell el-Yahudiyeh=Leontopolis=site of the Temple of Onias, is assailed, the conclusion reached being that, while Petrie has made out a clever case, it fails to carry complete conviction.

Other elements contribute to the uncertainty, among which the existence of 'doubles' may be instanced. The 'documentary theory' is accepted, and from this standpoint much of the O.T. record (especially P) can hardly be cited in proof, falling too late in time. Local colour is discredited as vague, being post-dated by several centuries, evidence not of the writer's knowledge but of his ignorance. This is specially marked in regard to geographical names (see below).

In his own findings Professor Peet adopts a moderate, at times a non-committal, attitude. He has chosen the Short Dating. There is a known date for Amraphel or Khammurabi, given as 2123 B.C. From this the sojourn of Abram in Egypt is in turn dated, and the entry of Jacob into Egypt is placed about 1876 B.C. In accordance with this the Exodus may probably be dated in the time of Amenhotep II. (*c.* 1446 B.C.). This leads on to consideration of the Khabiru-Sagaz=the Hebrews, a compromise being reached. 'If the Khabiru-Sagaz are not *as a whole* identical with the Hebrews

from Egypt they may be so in part.' Further results of excavation are awaited, however, before a final answer is given.

The Exodus in the reign of Merenptah is definitely rejected, as is the route by way of the Wadi Tumilat ('not a particle of evidence'). In this matter the anachronistic geography, almost always overlooked, is fully discussed. While uncertainty remains as to the route taken, a start in the region of Avaris (Pelusium) and Tell el-Her (Migdol) is to be looked for.

The investigations within the definitely historical period (after 1000 B.C.) need not be detailed. Professor Peet has subjected to strict scrutiny every identification already made, and seemingly well established, and his verdict as a rule is negative.

Chapter ix., 'The Jewish Colonies in Egypt,' is worthy of special mention. There is one reference to the late Lord Carnarvon, the discovery made by him dating some years back, and a few sentences are given to Tut-ankh-aton (later, Tut-ankh-amon).

SANDERSON OF OUNDLE.

A Life of *Sanderson of Oundle* has been published by Messrs. Chatto & Windus (12s. 6d. net). This Memorial of the life, work, thought, and teaching of Sanderson has been written by a group of friends and associates. But although the book perhaps loses somewhat through this fact—there is a certain amount of repetition—they have succeeded in making not only the man, but also the educational ideas for which he stood, very much alive.

Sanderson raised Oundle from obscurity to the position which it now holds among English Public Schools; and as it is impossible to think of Rugby without associating Arnold, or Uppingham without associating Thring, so it is impossible to think of Oundle without Sanderson.

As early as 1796 the Oundelian trend of Oundle became manifest. For about that date the teaching of technical science was introduced into the school. Boys were to receive 'a competent idea of the several manufactures and the metals from the rude material and the mines to their last improvement.' It was this Oundelian trend which Sanderson developed when he became headmaster of the school in September 1892. It had passed through many vicissitudes between 1796 and that date, and it was then in a low state, with the number of boys steadily dwindling. At this time the school had some reputation for turning out classical scholars and formal mathematicians; but scientific and technical subjects and modern languages were not included. Some idea of the work done by Sanderson may be gathered from chap. iv. which contains the following divisions: The Classical Side in Oundle School; The Workshops and Engineering Laboratory in Oundle School; Mathematics in Oundle School; Physics and Mechanics in Oundle School; Modern Languages in Oundle School; Music in Oundle School; Biology and Agriculture at Oundle; The Science Society and the Conversazione; The Cadet Corps; Religious Teaching in Oundle School.

One of the most interesting parts of the fourth chapter is an account of the development of the teaching of applied science. Sanderson was brought to the conviction 'that here was the means ready to hand of lifting science teaching generally to a higher plane.' He determined that the work in the Engineering Workshops should never become technical in the narrow sense of the term, and so lose its value as an educational medium. 'Practical problems were to lead the boy to the study of principles, and, more than that, they were to open up new avenues of work leading to the wider pastures of research and discovery. Applied science, he held, was complex and apparently difficult; yet it had romance and mystery which appealed to youth. Moreover, it was in direct contact with the ordinary life, the home life of the day. It was always progressing; there was less inducement to become conventional and stagnant and to fall a prey to stereotyped methods than there was in the study of general principles only. It had substance about it, and was full of information which was sought after, and it was always suggestive and stimulating to the curiosity.'

Sanderson studied the individual. He gave the minutest consideration to the diverse bents of the boys. With unceasing interest and delight he watched over the development of their characters and minds under the stimulation of the opportunities which he gave, and it was all done with one end in view, that the boys should be of service to their day and generation. And gradually the idea took hold of the school that the end of education was not possessiveness and individual accomplishment, but service.

This account of what Sanderson stood for in education cannot be safely neglected by Educa-

tionalists, nor can it be safely neglected by any one who has any part to play in education.

A NEW RELIGION.

Sir Francis Younghusband has an interesting mind with a happy knack of lighting upon interesting things. For example, he has in India a lifelong friend, a retired Government official whom he calls Svabhava, who all his days has been haunted by the feeling that it is for him to think out a new religion that will perfect and supersede all the existing ones, who has toiled ceaselessly, chiefly at western philosophy, it seems, to feel his way to that, and who believes he has discovered it, or at least its first satisfactory form. For he holds that truth is never final, never a closed system, but always an avenue leading on to something vaster, and better; and more; that, as we keep climbing, new peaks continually rise into view—that is our reward—that the hills throw back their heads, enticing us still higher. He is sure he has found something that the world supremely needs, something original that makes the old-established faiths seem tasteless and obsolete and faded. And in *The Gleam* (Murray; 12s.), Sir Francis sets down for us a record of his friend's mental history and its results so far.

This is a fascinating topic. For God's greatest gift to an age is a new prophet. And, hearing the rumour that a new authentic voice straight from the Divine has been heard in our day, we gather close about the bringer of the news and listen avidly; only to find that he somewhat disappoints, and raises expectations that he fails to realize. Sir Francis writes in a kind of hush of spirit. He believes whole-heartedly in his friend's originality—though how far he agrees with him we are not told—and creates the impression that he is always about to show us something startling. Yet, with the best wish in the world, it is a little difficult to share his enthusiasm beyond a point fairly soon reached. We are informed of 'immense strides forward,' but the ground covered is not always obvious; we have things printed sometimes in italics, so new are they, that are hoary with antiquity, till one is on occasion left wondering what notion of religion Sir Francis has before his mind when these trite axioms strike him as so novel. We are always being told of a wonderful spirit, but what we see is at times disappointingly ordinary—a mind spiritual and eager and haunted by a longing to sound the deeps of things, but shifting and unstable, apt to be swept to and fro by the newest teaching that affects him, a curious mind whose religion is very largely speculative, and who quite early dismisses the various faiths as outworn, without apparently ever having learned from personal and actual experience what they can do for those who have accepted them, as he himself did not. Towards Jesus Christ, for example, he is entirely reverent; he can talk about Him theologically interestingly enough—though there is nothing in the least striking—but he does not know Christ as a devout Christian knows Him, and so misses the point of the whole thing, and is a mere external critic. Somehow he leaves the impression that he is not likely to come on the new faith he seeks; that he has too little reverence for the past, this man who as a boy felt he must find it, though what it was to be he had little or no idea except that it was to be new, quite new. That is not how new faiths are found. A Buddha, a Mohammed, a Paul, a Luther exhaust the old religions, wringing out of them the last drop before they are reluctantly convinced by practical experience that though they have pushed them to the uttermost they won't do.

Yet Svabhava is sure he has found the object of his quest. Let us set it down in Sir Francis Younghusband's words—this new religion that is to make Buddha and Mohammed and the prophets and Christ mere dull back numbers, whose passing interest is largely gone; mere dying stars, their lustre dimmed by this fierce new light.

'To summarize his conception: Svabhava conceives of the world as a Person (a Super Person), as Mother-World. Of this Person whatever we see as the outward natural world (including the bodies of human beings) is the "body" and what we speak of as God is the "mind." And the Godhead of God resides in special highly developed individuals as the intellect resides in special highly developed cells of the brain. The individual man is the son of Mother-World as he is the son of Motherland. And between him and Mother-World there is reciprocal love as there is between him and his Motherland. He both affects and is affected by Mother-World.

And from this world-love between him and Mother-World there springs a determination so to make the best of himself and do his best for the world. And the better he succeeds the greater he is. This is a Svabhava's faith and a simpler could

not be found.' None the less there still seems a chance for the older prophets.

A HISTORY OF QUAKERISM.

Quakerism has been fortunate in its historians, and its historians have been fortunate in the abundance of material lying ready to their hands. Within recent years the ground has been fully covered by the work of Dr. Rufus M. Jones and Mr. W. C. Braithwaite who co-operated in producing a standard history of Quakerism. Mr. Braithwaite's sister, Elizabeth B. Emmott, has now written *A Short History of Quakerism* (Swarthmore Press; 10s. 6d. net), which will be welcomed by many who have not found it possible to read the larger work. The story is told with rare skill, which holds the interest of the reader throughout. Having traced the antecedents of Quakerism to the mystics of the Middle Ages and the Reformation, the writer devotes the main part of the book to a narrative of the life and labours of Fox, Penn, and the other pioneers. The story of their heroic witness to the inner light, and of their patience under suffering and persecution, is one that deserves to be better known, for it is perhaps the purest in the annals of Protestantism.

Doubtless Quakerism had its weaker side of delusion and obstinacy. Among the rank and file there must have been not a few whose impulses and leadings were the fruit of a disordered fancy, and whose extravagant actions set men like John Bunyan and Richard Baxter against them. But when every allowance is made, the verdict of Professor Masson in his 'Life of John Milton' will stand. 'In fact, the Quakers behaved magnificently. By their peculiar method of open violation of the law and passive resistance only, they rendered a service to the common cause of all the Nonconformist sects which has never been sufficiently acknowledged.'

A concluding chapter is devoted to an exposition of the Quaker way of life. The whole book is one which deserves to be widely read, and its publication seems opportune at a time when so many are seeking to solve the dreadful problem of war, and to find some new and more Christian basis for the social order.

LIBERAL EVANGELICALISM.

It is a very new world in which we live, and restatement is the order of the day. For the old truths have to be translated into an altogether novel language and accent. *Liberal Evangelicalism* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) is 'an attempt to produce a reasoned and coherent statement of the theological position of the people within the Church of England known as Liberal Evangelicals.' It is the work of a group of friends, men like Burroughs and Barnes and Guy Rogers, who already hold the eyes of their generation, and are sure to have a big say in the future of their Church, and of the religious thinking of the whole country. It is a noteworthy book, frank, reverent, helpful. But among many good qualities what stands out constantly is its obvious sincerity; that, and the deep religious passion that lies at the back of it. Very honest is its historical account of evangelicalism, that movement to which they are so proud to belong, of its glory, and its weaknesses, and the adjustments that must be made if it is to repeat its spiritual triumphs in our day: very loyal to truth is its handling of such central themes as the Bible, and the Person and the Work of Jesus Christ: very hopeful is its treatment of such thorny problems as Reunion, the Church, the Sacraments: very heartening its certainty that under the new conditions, and stated in a form to suit the modern mind, the gospel can be preached with the old thrill, and the old enthusiasm, and the old splendour of result. One of the deepest essays is that of Dean Burroughs on 'Evangelicalism and Personality.' Certainly the most fascinating is that of Canon Barnes on 'The Future of the Evangelical Movement.' He is no Modernist, so he declares, in the Roman Catholic sense; he is no Catholic in the sectarian meaning of that word; he is an evangelical, convinced that Evangelicalism will become the religion of the world, if it can free itself from its own type of scholasticism, from its intolerance of new ideas, from its too narrow scheme of theology, above all, perhaps, from its two grave hindrances—its Apollinarian heresy that regards Christ as only 'an apparent man with a Divine mind': and its Bibliolatry, with which he confesses much personal sympathy. Let us treat the Bible frankly, as Paul and Luther did in their day; let us lay aside our fears; let us believe in God; and the future lies with us, he says. This is a fine and stimulating book.

THE BAKITARA.

Even in this age there are few spheres in which the patient amassing of facts difficult of discovery

is being pursued with more assiduity and thoroughness than in that of Ethnology and Primitive Religion; and still fewer probably where the pioneers must walk with anxious caution lest, tricked themselves into error, they lead subsequent scholars far astray, till some later investigator undoes their unconscious ministry. In *The Bakitara*, by John Roscoe (Cambridge University Press; 25s.), we have a reliable study by an accredited and competent authority whose credentials are beyond dispute. This is the first volume of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa, which owes its inception to Sir J. G. Frazer, was financed by Sir Peter Mackie, and was put into the hands of Canon Roscoe by the Royal Society. And right well has he justified that honourable selection. He used no English interpreter. Even when 'it was necessary to appeal to some native who knew a language common to myself and the person under examination, all the information came to me through a native medium uninfluenced by contact with the western world.' Moreover, the king was most helpful, and even arranged a week's pageant of the old ceremonies, allowing them to be photographed and the book to be thus greatly embellished.

This first volume deals with a large tribe (whose territory lies in Uganda on the east side of Lake Albert) still important, but who a few generations back were much more powerful than they are to-day—a nomadic pastoral people intermixed with agriculturalists, which latter were originally a curiously free type of serf with large rights.

The book is full of interesting facts concerning the life and customs, and, to some degree, the thought of the people, of the Royal Family, and, above all, of the King.

What strikes one, perhaps, first is the immense place held by cows and milk and everything connected with them. Thus the dairy is one of the most important parts of the royal palace; there, on a special bed, the King must pass part of every night, and when he enters it sleep is finished for that night for his household; the milkers of the cows have to be eminently chaste, and when on duty may not look at a woman; the very herd-boy is a sacrosanct person. When the King drinks milk it is an imposing and mysterious ceremony. He sits on a special stool; there is present no one but the milkmaid—a most important personage, who, when he is in the act of drinking, kneels with closed eyes, and there is absolute silence in the royal enclosure, all reverently kneeling with faces covered. When the King's death is announced, it is by a young man shouting from a pinnacle, 'The milk is spilt.' And this list might be indefinitely increased. Arresting, too, is the Sword Busitama, for which, without word spoken, the king stretches out his hand on various occasions. If, for example, there is talking in the Courts of Justice he forthwith silently smites somebody down; or going the round of his guards at night he brings swift punishment for drowsiness; or in the fashioning of the bow of a new king, strung in part with the sinews of a living man who gladly gives his life for the honour. Canon Roscoe, indeed, uses the past tense throughout, for the customs are dying.

This is a fine book that will have to be added to the library of many a scholar, and that would make a starting-point for new recruits.

THE ONE GREAT STORY.

The One Great Story needs to be told afresh for every generation and for every age in it, and the Rev. Frank Ilsley Paradise has set himself to do this for the youth of our time in his book, *Jesus Christ and the Spirit of Youth* (Mills & Boon; 8s. 6d. net). He realizes the gap that often exists between the happy traditional faith of childhood and the perplexities of later years in such a world and in such a time as ours, and he has endeavoured to capture the loyalty and faith of the growing and inquiring mind for Jesus by presenting to it a picture of His life and His great service to humanity that will appeal to all that is best in the life of youth. It was a difficult task, but it has been well done. Mr. Paradise brings to it a breadth of mind that sets aside the things that are secondary and fixes our attention on the great things that matter. He has steeped his own spirit in the spirit of Jesus and has given us a picture of the life, stage by stage, which is very beautiful and very inspiring. We cannot think of any better gift for a young man or woman interested in questions of the faith and yet troubled by the difficulties and contradictions of life. It will bring such minds face to face with reality, and especially with reality in its most gracious and commanding form.

BUDDHA.

Of books on Buddhism there is no end, but few of them have value. All too many are mere hurried compilations at third hand, with no adequate knowledge. The number of those with any right to speak on one of the most complicated subjects is still incredibly small. Yet happily, of course, they exist; and still more fortunately the group tends to grow. Mr. Kenneth J. Saunders is steadily pushing his way into an unchallengeable place in the small circle. His qualifications are many—among them a thorough knowledge of Pali, the correct attitude of mind, the amassed facts, the needed skill and interest as a teacher. *Gotama Buddha* ('Heritage of India Series': Milford; 2s. 6d. net) is a cheap little book. And yet it is, perhaps, as good as anything in English as a first introduction not so much to the teaching as to the fascinating personality of the great soul who has cut his name deeper than any other into the life and thought and history of the East.

Nothing, says Mr. John Lewis, B.Sc., is so desperately needed by the modern world as prophetic statesmanship; and he has written his book, *The Old Testament in the Twentieth Century* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), to show the practical relevance of that great literature to the problems of religion and society to-day. By concentrating chiefly upon the critical men and events he has given us a very vivid and rememberable sketch of Old Testament history, which he has illumined at many points by suggestive modern parallels. The fusion of Hebrew and Canaanite, *e.g.*, recalls the fusion of Saxon and Norman; David is in one aspect a sort of Robin Hood, in another a sort of Zulu chief. The discussion, which is everywhere alive, offers a fine combination of fearlessness and reverence, and it is always unabashedly modern. 'The biographies of Elijah and Elisha are as full of legend as are the lives of St. Francis,' and the prophetic visions were 'subjective mental disturbances and not miraculous revelations.' Once the description is almost too modern. Mr. Lewis tells us that the prophets would be called 'Bolshevists' to-day. But surely not by any one who properly understood them. Amos' criticism of society is drastic enough; but the man whose message was 'Seek Jehovah, and ye shall live' (5^6), is hardly comparable to the Bolshevists as we know them. The Book of Ruth gets less than justice when it is described as a story of 'very little religious value'; elsewhere in the volume there is a truer estimate of it as a counterblast to the narrow nationalism of Ezra. Nazirite always appears as Nazarite. Appended are some very useful and easily intelligible diagrams illustrating both the progress of the history and the development of religious ideas. This volume makes an excellent beginning to the projected 'Christian Social Histories,' 'designed for those who are working for a Christian Commonwealth and who have chosen the method of education in Christian citizenship.'

Professor Widgery has an epilogue to his 'Outlines of a Philosophy of Life,' in which he deplores that humour finds so small a place in the formal systems of thought. Mr. J. Y. T. Greig, M.A., in *The Psychology of Laughter and Comedy* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), has let his thinking play upon that subject, and has produced a book behind which lies a mass of reading. The literature on laughter is a large one, and Mr. Greig has explored almost every corner of it with curiosity and care. There is a huge bibliography of nineteen pages dealing with hundreds of volumes, and an appendix, fifty-five pages long, giving an historical survey of the various theories that have been held on comedy and upon why we laugh, which makes interesting reading. It is curious to note how many follow Plato in his verdict that malice lies at the base of it, or take other sombre views. Rousseau felt that, even at its best, comedy performs no useful social function and can be very harmful, while Baudelaire regarded laughter as the mark of man's fall! Others of course—Sidney, Harrington, Molière, Ben Jonson—believe that humour can be put to high and stately uses, but nobody has a view of it anything like so genial and kindly as that of Carlyle. Upon the whole, after perusing these various opinions, one feels there is not a little to be said for Voltaire's blunt and downright judgment, that 'no one doubts that the laugh is a sign of joy, just as tears are a symptom of pain; and any one who pushes his curiosity further in the matter is a fool.' Mr. Greig, however, does not agree: and has evolved a theory of his own. Though he sweeps us through all kinds of places, he begins at the beginning, and believes that a smile is due to an infant's sucking and the pleasant associations therewith, and that laughter is a 'response directly

or indirectly related to the behaviour of the instinct of love.' Children—ay, and the rest of us—so it appears, do not know it, but when they laugh at a clown, or Punch and Judy, or a man falling, or a hat blown off, or a drunkard—which nice children would not do—or ninepins, or the devil, they are being played upon by instincts of sex. So Mr. Greig affirms, and people can believe it if they choose. But Quintilian once remarked of laughter, 'I do not think that any one has explained it satisfactorily, though many have tried.' And Mr. Greig's book leaves that ancient verdict undisturbed.

Jeremiah has been very much in evidence of recent years. We have had Mr. W. R. Thomson's 'Burden of the Lord,' Principal Skinner's scholarly and comprehensive study of the prophet in his 'Prophecy and Religion,' and Principal Sir George Adam Smith's lectures delivered in Glasgow last year, to the publication of which we look eagerly forward. This is no doubt significant, for the convulsed world to which Jeremiah delivered his message is not unlike our own. And now comes another short study of *Jeremiah the Prophet of Hope*, by Dorothea Stephen (Cambridge University Press; 4s. 6d. net). This unpretentious little book will serve a useful purpose. The prophecies of Jeremiah, it is well known, are sadly in need of chronological rearrangement. As they stand, neither the history nor the development of Jeremiah's mind can be easily followed. This book supplies the necessary rearrangement. The life of the prophet is divided into six periods, and the discussion, conducted on the basis of the rearrangement, enables us to see the tragedy of that great life unfold—the tragedy which was also a triumph. The book is simply written; and as it is entirely free from technicalities, attention is concentrated all the time on really vital issues. Its brevity and avoidance of the irrelevant combine to make it an admirable introduction to the study of Jeremiah, whose story, as the writer says, 'in days when hope is not a sentiment but a task and an adventure, has a new value for us.' But why does she always spell Jehoiakim with *ch*? The analogy with Jehoichin is misleading, as the Hebrew letters are different.

The literature on St. Francis is enormous. But students of that strange and fascinating figure who desire to be up to date will have to find room on their shelves for yet another book. Nor should they grudge it. For it is pretty to look at, excellently printed, embellished with some interesting etchings, and, best of all, written with fullness of knowledge, and in an admirable spirit, by an eager mind absorbed in its subject. Mr. D. H. S. Nicholson is of opinion that in the mass of studies of the saint a curiously small place has been given to that mysticism which was so obviously an inherent element in his personality and religion. And in *The Mysticism of Saint Francis of Assisi* (Cape; 12s. 6d. net) he sets out to fill the gap. What he gives us is a careful, and indeed masterly, portrait of the proverbially elusive if arresting mind, painted by a discriminating affection, with much erudition in the field of mysticism for a background, from which the central figure, none the less, stands out vividly.

The Message of Mohammed, by Ardaser Sorabjee N. Wadia, M.A., sometime Professor of English and History at Elphinstone College, Bombay (Dent; 3s. 6d.), is an unusually successful little book, to be warmly commended to all desirous of knowing what the faith of so many of our fellow-subjects really is. It is written by a devout, convinced, but singularly honest mind, who wins our trust at once by his wise attitude to the other religions, by his refusal to evade uncomfortable facts concerning his own, by his frank criticism here and there of his fellow-Moslems, of the Koran, even of the Prophet. Yet he is all athrill with gratitude and reverence toward one who is to him the Master of all Masters, proud of his faith and its wonderful achievements, and very wistful that its old glories may be revived.

This is a lucid and well-written study of the prophet and the main lines of his teaching. It meets with dignity and point certain misconceptions of the one or the other, and, while it leaves some dark shadows on the picture, it increases the reader's respect for both. Moreover, it is a beautiful little book, and for these days really cheap. By the way, is it quite hopeless that the maddening diversity in the spelling of the prophet's name should somehow cease?

The Resurrection Body (Doran; $1 net), by the Rev. Wilbert W. White, Ph.D., D.D., is too small a book for such a difficult subject. The criticism of Harnack's distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message is good, but not very original. The same remark applies to the conten-

tion that 'the distinctive teaching of Christianity about the future is not that the soul is immortal. Paganism teaches that. It is, that there is the resurrection of the body.' The obstacles to acceptance of this doctrine are frankly recognized, and the crude forms in which it has been held are set aside; but, as indicated, the treatment of the subject is too slight to be very helpful. The author's original view of the resurrection body of Jesus—that it was outside the tomb before the stone was rolled away—is interesting rather than important, even if it be true.

The personality of a great man makes almost any biography of him popular, and one does not wonder that when it is well done, even a slight sketch makes a place for itself. *Radiant Christianity: The Life-Story of Henry Drummond*, by Mr. A. H. Walker, B.A. (Epworth Press; 1s.), has been reprinted five times, and a new edition has just been issued. It is a small book, and the 'life-story' is only a sketch, but it is very well done indeed, and has a distinct note. Drummond is taken as a representative of vivid and joyous religion, and his own character and his message to youth are shown to bear out the description. We commend Mr. Walker's little book cordially, and hope for the new edition a wide influence.

In *A Little Road-Book for Mystics* (Faith Press; 2s. 6d. net), Aelfrida Tillyard has many helpful things to say to all who fain would be 'friends of God, well accustomed to sweet and familiar converse with Him.'

Mr. Sydney Walton wrote numerous short articles which were published here and there under the title of 'Whispers from the Pew.' In response to the representations of friends he has published them in book form under the title *The Sieve of Blindness* (Garrod; 5s. net). That is the title of the first paper. The book might have been better named after another of them—'An Apostle of the Obvious.' When the obvious, however, is clothed with such fine literary form as Mr. Walton gives it, it is by no means to be despised.

How many authors can say of their books what Mr. D. S. Brown, M.A., of Rousay, Orkney, says of his? It is called *The Faith that works by Love* (Edinburgh: Henderson; 5s. net), and he says that he re-wrote it annually for years, thinking over every sentence and over its teaching. All this because his mind was possessed with an idea that became more and more fruitful and suggestive, the idea of man's essential union with God. This is the truth the book is designed to prove. Faith is the condition of this union, love the soul of it, and 'works' the result of it. This is just Christian mysticism. The real message of the book, however, is no general truth like that but something very definite, the *essential* and *primal* oneness of man with God. And so there is a golden chapter on 'The Spiritual Union of Infancy,' in which the writer shows that this elemental eternal element, God in us, is in us from the beginning. It is a seed of the great things to come. It is unconscious, but it is the ground or centre of our being, and it is there in every single human soul. It is primitive, rudimentary, but it is *life*, and the first of the three graded states of life—the seed beginnings, the second birth, and the long unfolding of the life of God in the soul. The rest of the book is excellent, but this first chapter should be read by all teachers and parents. They would realize that as education is the development of personality, the religious factor lies at the foundation of all education.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published an interesting little book by Mr. George Radford, M.A., which he calls *Remembrance: A Lenten Reverie* (2s. net). It deals, in a thoughtful, meditative manner, with the profoundest of all problems, the purpose of God in creation and redemption. God had a purpose which He has been patiently working out all these centuries. This is the 'Great Design,' and the writer traces it through its stages and shows how, amid, and by means of, conflict, choice, and pain, it has been realizing itself. Its goal is sonship and the reign of perfect truth on earth. This 'reverie' is a suggestive and helpful piece of work.

The Zionist policy of colonizing Palestine and transforming it into a Jewish State has become, since the War, a question of international politics. If you wish to realize what life in the land of Israel means to a patriotic Jew, then read *The Feet of the Messenger*, by Yehoash (Solomon Bloomgarden) (The Jewish Publication Society of America). The book purports to be translated from the Yiddish by Isaac Goldberg, but one thing is certain,

it is the work of a master of English. A really remarkable book, it gives a vivid account of the experiences of a Jew from New York who settled in one of the Jewish colonies near Jaffa, until driven out of Palestine by the world war.

A deathless ardour for the ancient homeland breathes on every page. 'We passed by an old barefoot Arab who was leading a loaded camel. *His* forefathers for I don't know how many generations back had surely driven camels and grazed their sheep on this self-same spot, and had pitched here their black tents, lighting fires at evening, baking "pitties," and afterwards sitting around the fire telling stories in the tranquil night. I had only just arrived, from a distant land—had not yet slept a night in Eretz Yisroel—had not yet drunk a glass of water in it, not yet walked ten yards upon its soil, and yet—*I* felt more rooted here than he. *I* was the long established dweller. From the blood there leaped the muffled clamour of centuries: "My birthright."'

Strangely enough the writer sets little store by Jerusalem. He can gaze calmly upon the Jews' Wailing Place; he has no dream of a restored Temple, and evidently little expectation of a Messiah still to come. His religion has none of the dark features of later Judaism, but rather is akin to the sunnier side of Israel's ancient faith with its harvest and vintage festivals. His hope for the future is that the time will come again when on the great holidays 'Jewish daughters will come out to dance and frolic in the vineyards.'

The writer has a wonderful power of making one see the Jew at work in Palestine, and of making manifest by many a subtle touch that Zionism is a spiritual force to be reckoned with.

What mean Ye by this Service? by 'Elizabeth' (Longmans; paper 9d., cloth 1s. 6d.), is a brief explanation of the Communion Service of the Church of England. It is in dialogue form, a young girl voicing her difficulties, and a grown-up friend answering these, taking each part of the service in turn and expounding it simply and clearly. The little book will be very helpful both to clergy and catechumens.

In *The Harmony and Unity of the Kingdom of God* (London: Lyal; 1s.), the writer, Mr. John Coutts, in the form of a dialogue between 'Student' and 'Enquirer,' discusses many of the fundamental problems of thought and existence. His main idea seems to be that of a profound harmony between all forms of being as equally revelations of the unseen Spirit of God. This idea is worked out in a series of studies on 'Man the Microcosm of Creation,' 'The Work of the Holy Spirit,' 'The Spiritual Kingdom of Law and Grace,' and 'The Intellectual Realm in Divine Order.' There are profound thoughts struggling for expression here, sometimes in queer forms but always with intense earnestness and the sense of a message.

'Reading,' said Bacon, 'maketh a full man.' But obviously that depends upon the type of book on which one feeds. Without doubt, however, *The Idea of God*, by Professor C. A. Beckwith, Illinois Professor of Christian Theology in Chicago Theological Seminary (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), falls well within the dictum. This is a full book that fills the reader's mind, built on a large scale, and sweeping one through a wide tract of interesting country. It starts out from the axiom that the old historic idea of God has ceased to be adequate: that masses of facts in our modern life and thought, such as the new views of the Bible, the new psychology, the new social emphasis in religion, are clamouring for a re-defining of Him. There is always much knowledge, usually a shrewd insight, and now and then a touch of audacity in this careful consideration of the long brooding of the human spirit upon God, and of the immense range of topics that impinge on that, or that flow out of it; and in the persistent feeling and groping of the author's hands towards a new statement satisfying to his mind. In the end he defines God as creative or purposive Goodwill, and in an interesting final chapter attempts to show us how our sacred things, prayer and the like, look in the light of that. Yet one supposes that he does not himself lay undue stress upon it; for, speaking of Paul and of Jesus among others, he remarks that while 'each of these ideas of God was in turn adequate for the particular period in which it appeared, it became progressively insufficient for later conditions.' If this be so, his own reading of the Divine is not likely to have a long run; but it may help some minds while it lasts.

In *Christianity and Liberalism*, by the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D. (Macmillan), we have a statement of orthodoxy as against modernism

which, whether we agree with it or not, commands our respect. We are glad to find so much with which we are in agreement. We have no more use for 'liberalism' than Dr. Machen has, if by liberalism we are to understand a vague medley of views which take all the substance out of sin and redemption, out of the Person and work of Christ. We heartily assent likewise to Dr. Machen's powerful exposure of the futility of the cry for a creedless Church. On those topics we most cordially commend the book. On some other points we cannot extend to the author's treatment the same measure of praise. The chapter on the Bible is quite unworthy of the author's ability. So is what he says on the Fatherhood of God. Here Dr. Machen is confused, unconvincing, and self-contradictory. 'The modern doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God is not to be found in the teaching of Jesus.' 'And it is not to be found in the New Testament.' Yet on the same page (p. 61) we find this: 'Something analogous to a universal fatherhood of God is taught in the New Testament. Here and there the terminology of fatherhood and sonship is even used to describe this general relationship.' What are we to make of Dr. Machen here? Then as to his demand that 'liberals' should separate themselves from the orthodox, Dr. Machen should surely be aware that such clear-cut distinctions are never practically possible. He apparently is prepared to make the Westminster Confession the test. Its meaning he says is unmistakable. But does Dr. Machen himself accept sincerely, and in the plain sense of the words, the teaching of the Confession as to the duties of the civil magistrate to protect the Church from heresy? We hope not. Or does he honestly believe that in the plain sense of the word the world was made in six days? We doubt it. We assume that on both these points Dr. Machen is at variance with the thought of the seventeenth century. If he is to diverge from the standard on such points and remain within the Presbyterian Church, he must learn to speak with less dogmatism of the necessity of other divergents going out to the wilderness.

The stream of missionary biography flows from a perennial spring and continues without intermission to refresh God's heritage. *McCullagh of Aiyansh*, by the Rev. J. W. W. Moeran (Marshall Brothers; 6s. net), is the story of one who spent his life among the North American Indians. Their success among the Indians of the great North-West is a particular star in the crown of the Church Missionary Society, and no finer spirit ever went forth to that work than James McCullagh. Of Irish parentage, he was a born soldier and served in the army till he was twenty-nine. Then he had the unique experience, while serving in Malta, of receiving on one and the same day his commission as an officer and his call to become a missionary of the C.M.S. He chose the latter, and found his sphere among the Naas Indians in British Columbia, where he laboured for thirty-eight years.

The story of his life is well told, and abounds in thrilling incidents, while over all is the indescribable glamour of pine forest and mountain, canoe and dog-sleigh. McCullagh faced and subdued the rudest savagery. He offered his bare breast to the assassin's knife; he stood over the grave of his first convert, tracing around him a circle in the snow, and defying a horde of cannibals who had come to dig up and devour the body. Under stress of dire necessity he amputated frost-bitten feet with his pocket-knife; he hammered out his own forceps while his first dental patient waited; he marched with the Indians, carrying his own kit of seventy pounds weight. 'What I really desired was to feel in my own body the hardships and temptations peculiar to the Indian, that I might be able to understand him better, and sympathise with him more fully.' He passed through perils of fire and flood, endured trials from the heathen, and no less from his own converts. Yet his hand turned not back from the plough, and he had at last the joy not merely of converting a tribe from heathenism, but of building up a Christian society. Here truly was one who did his work like a man and a Christian, and so long as such lives are lived and such transformations are wrought, the Church may proudly say, what an old Indian chief said to McCullagh, 'Now let the heathen hold their peace, it is manifest to the whole world that God is with us.'

'In books and journals and lectures, the teacher is often referred to the authority of Froebel or Pestalozzi or James or Madame Montessori; why not, then, to Jesus, the highest Authority of all?' writes the Rev. Harold Wilson, M.A., in *Children as Jesus saw Them* (National Sunday School Union; 9d. net), a charming little booklet containing a fresh study of childhood as it appears in the Gospels.

He collects and reviews all the incidents and sayings concerning Jesus and the children in the fourfold record. It is a human study, not without knowledge of what has been done for the psychology of children, grading and all the rest, but altogether inspired by a fresh mind and a real love for children themselves. Teachers and parents alike will find much to reflect upon in this delightful little book, which, we may add, is adorned by many literary references and quotations.

The Rev. W. A. H. Legg, M.A., died in 1921 after a very influential ministry. He was, we are told by the Rev. Edward Shillito, a brilliant preacher, and it was given to Mr. Shillito to select from his literary remains a representative body of his sermons. This has been done in an interesting volume entitled *Life Beyond the Grave* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net). There are six sermons, all dealing with questions bearing on a future existence. They face frankly, fearlessly, and also competently, the three points on which most people's minds concentrate at present: Is there any future opportunity of repentance? Is it certain we shall recognize each other beyond the grave? And what is the value of the spiritualist contribution to the hope of a future life? These matters will be found discussed in the sermons, with caution where caution is needed, and with perfect confidence where this is what the heart demands.

In the general tendency to apply the New Psychology all round to different fields of human mentality it was inevitable that it should be directed to political theory and practice, and this has been attempted in a very interesting book, *Social Life and the Crowd*, by Mr. J. Lionel Tayler, L.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., London University Extension Lecturer on Biology and Sociology (Leonard Parsons; 7s. 6d. net). While orthodox Psychology deals with conscious processes and emphasizes reason, the New Psychology assures us that the source of behaviour and belief is to be found in instinct and desire, hidden for the most part in the unconscious and merely camouflaged as rational. Mr. Tayler operates with this conclusion. He points out that real aristocracies and real democracies have never existed in this imperfect world. Peoples have been swayed by custom, desire, and gregarious inclinations. These, and not rationalism or truth, have influenced political action. Words like 'reason' and 'truth' have been the weapons of controversy, but the real combatants have been rival desires. Men and women are not fundamentally reasonable beings at all, and therefore the idea that only education is needed to produce a true democracy is fallacious. What is needed is some powerful influence to orientate human desire and train it for the service of humanity, in other words, ideals of social and personal evolution. This influence is to be found in the education of the human individual in the different and enlarging spheres of his interest—the family, the nation, and humanity. This is the path of increasing progress. This will give the widening outlook and enlarging experience which alone can supply its opportunity to that Power that presides over our rivalries and bickerings and is ever shaping our destiny.

The Great Seal of the Gospel, edited by Mr. Alexander Marshall (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d.), is a collection of 'true tales and forcible facts' about men and women who 'set their seal that God is true.' In other words, it is a book of short anecdotes to be used in evangelistic work, illustrative of ways and means of conversion.

A companion volume to the above is *Paths of Peace*, edited by Mr. John Gray (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d.). This book is a 'storehouse of studies, outlines, records, eyegate lessons, helpful notes, for Bible students and busy workers.' This description will indicate the nature of the contents. There are Bible studies, brief records of more or less well-known religious persons, gems of prose and poetry, anecdotes and outline addresses. Both books occupy the same standpoint, which, without offence, may be described as that of the 'mission-hall.'

A small volume of Devotional Studies for Lent and Holy Week has been published by Messrs. Skeffington (2s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D. He is the Incumbent of St. Germain's, Blackheath, and we are told in the foreword that the little book, to which he gives the title of *The Atonement and the Eucharist*, is the outcome of 'private meditations made day by day during Holy Week and shared each evening with those faithful ones of his own flock to whom the preacher could speak intimately about such holy mysteries.' The idea of the contact between the Atonement and the Eucharist is worked out in each

of the Devotional Studies. This small volume might well be used by the believer to the growth of his spiritual life.

A volume of Studies in Church History has been issued by the S.P.C.K. from the pen of the Rev. R. S. Arrowsmith, M.A., Rector of Seale, Surrey. It deals with the period from Wycliffe to the breach with Rome, under the title *The Prelude to the Reformation* (8s. net). It is not a complete history of the period, for such important subjects as the Friars, Lollardy, and the significance of the Renaissance have been omitted. In point of fact it is correctly described as a 'study,' an inquiry into the conditions of Church life in the period under review and in certain aspects only. Within these limits (self-imposed, of course) the present volume is one not only of real merit but of very great interest. Its chief merit is that it is first-hand research and based on original documents. Mr. Arrowsmith has made excellent use of the episcopal registers published in the last few years, and of the episcopal 'Visitations' which refer to his period.

Religion had a large part in mediæval life, and the Church exercised a wide influence. But in the period preceding the Reformation it was in no respect worthy of its great opportunity. The bishops were largely non-resident and only visited their dioceses (when they visited them at all) occasionally. They were worldly, venal, and frequently immoral. One of them refused to allow his clergy to put away their mistresses, because, if he did so, he would lose the fines payable for episcopal permission to keep mistresses. The clergy followed the bishops, and the picture drawn here on the authority of the 'Visitations' is one which shows how inevitable reformation must have been if religion was to survive at all. Chapters are given in this fascinating story to the Bishop, the Cathedral clergy, the parish priests, and the religious houses, and a vivid picture of mediæval life concludes the volume. In the course of the narrative many interesting glimpses are given to us not only of dark interiors but of the brighter aspects of religious life. On the whole, however, the prevailing tone is sombre, and Mr. Arrowsmith is ruthlessly frank. He has produced a monograph which is authoritative and from beginning to end thoroughly engrossing.

The Constructive Revolution of Jesus, by Professor Samuel Dickey (Swarthmore Press; 6s. net), is a vivid book that ought to be read, and that should prove a moral stimulus to those who study it. The point is that even yet we have hardly begun to grasp how great a Figure and how original a mind it was that suddenly arose in Galilee, with the result that what we call our Christianity is a tame affair, a colourless shadow barely worthy of the name. With knowledge and aptness the world of our Lord is described, its parties, its outlook, its problems, its movements of thought, and in the midst of it Jesus with His revolutionary mind, His amazing daring, His cataclysmic thoughts, 'His moral effrontery,' all leading up to a searching study of His attitude to the economic order of His own day and of ours. This last is a thorny subject; but Dr. Dickey, while fearless, is always sane and temperate and careful to found upon Scripture. The main impression left upon one is a healthy sense of our Lord's bigness, and the littleness of our attempts, so far, to follow Him, and think His great thoughts after Him.

Canon J. B. Lancelot, M.A., who delivered the Pilkington Lecture in 1922, chose for the subject of it *The Verdict of Experience*. He took for his text Nathanael's question, 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' The Lecture has now been published (Liverpool: Thompson & Co.; 1s.).

Mr. A. G. Widgery, M.A., is now lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion at Cambridge, but formerly he was Professor of Philosophy and Comparative Study of Religions in the College at Baroda. And, before leaving India, he published there a work on the latter subject which is a reliable guide to those setting out into this fine line of country; while those who long ago staked out a claim in it, and have been working ever since at its inexhaustible deposits, will find many things here heaped together for them in a handy form, and often real additions to their knowledge. The aim of *The Comparative Study of Religions* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d. net) is 'to describe some of the chief facts of the religions, and these, as far as possible in the language of the sacred scriptures, liturgies, and formularies of the religions themselves.' An informing introduction is followed by crowded yet lucid chapters on The Sources and Nature of Religious Truth, Supernatural Beings, The Soul, Sin and Suffering, Salvation and Redemption, Religious Practices, The

Emotional Attitudes, and Religious Ideals. The method in each chapter is to heap together masses of facts patiently gathered, and then to set down the conclusions drawn from them. A useful book.

The Maharajah Gaekwar of Baroda appears to approximate closely to the old Greek dream of what a ruler ought to be. For one thing, he is much interested in practical philosophy; and Mr. A. G. Widgery, M.A., some time ago published in India, under the title 'Goods and Bads,' some philosophical talks he was invited to have with him. This book he now reprints in the West, calling it *Outlines of a Philosophy of Life* (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). It has the interest of a first walk through a great city. For, while the author keeps well within the boundaries of his title, one never knows what one will come upon round the next corner. The chapter on Intellectual Values climbs, naturally, to the heights of Theism and Philosophy; but that on Physical Values lands one, not so expectedly, in town planning, and drainage, and games for girls, and sex, and other things; and that on Moral Values in such problems as love marriages, boarding schools or day schools, socialism—to name three. This is a fresh little work.

Compromise and the New Testament.

By the Reverend J. H. Watt, M.A., Rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Edinburgh.

A paper on an abstract subject wisely begins with an attempt at definition, and a search for a definition of 'compromise' at once reveals the fact that the word has two senses, one good, one bad. Thus Murray's *Oxford Dictionary* defines it in the good sense as follows: 'Adjustment for practical purposes of rival courses of action, systems or theories, conflicting opinions or principles by the sacrifice or surrender of a part of each.' It also defines the verb in the bad sense: 'to expose to risk or danger, to imperil' some political, intellectual, or moral cause or principle. Perhaps it is also worth noting that of the seven different shades of meaning there illustrated, six are in a good sense and only one in a bad.

It has been wittily said that those who now use and cite the Old and New Testament have to 'mind their P's and Q's,' and of course the problem of *ipsissima verba* is increasingly urgent. Yet it is surely still legitimate and possible to draw a general inference and to establish general principles without stopping to discuss the genuineness of each saying. The purpose of the present essay is to appeal to the spirit and not the letter, and to give the general impression conveyed by a body of evidence rather than to use the worn-out and doubtful method of proof texts.

The subject falls readily enough into four sections. The first considers compromise as an element in human character, the second reviews its influence in human history, the third summarizes the evidence of the New Testament, and the last and least satisfactory endeavours to find some practical principles and conclusions and seems to achieve most meagre success.

1. *Compromise and human nature.*—Compromise and its opposite go deep into nature. Indeed it sometimes seems as if the compromising and uncompromising were permanent elements of temperament. Certainly some people seem to be hot-headed, relentless, unbending, uncompromising from their mother's womb, though they might glory in their own zeal and be far from sharing Jeremiah's regret—'Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife.' Certainly the instinct for accommodation seems equally congenital in others. It would be possible to risk two generalizations which may at least promote discussion. In matters intellectual man is less prone to compromise than woman: respect and zeal for truth seem to be stronger in man. On the other hand, in matters moral, woman is less prone to compromise than man, more ready for resistance on an issue, braver if less tolerant, more zealous if less patient.

However this may be, we do know well the two types in human nature. The first, the uncompromising, have clear-cut principles, hard and shining to themselves as diamonds. To them doubt is dishonesty and faltering sin. They will apply their

principle relentlessly, die for it if need be in the last ditch, or charge on, unquenchable, through the Valley of Desolation to the Delectable Mountains.

The compromising, accommodating type is equally plain. It is cautious, common sense, tolerant, preferring safety to speed. It is always concerned with what is practical and expedient at the moment. Paris to the compromising is always worth a mass, or, as we should say in the twentieth century, Madrid is worth a mass, and if they cannot get a shilling, they will be content with ninepence. Needless to say, it is hard for any one to judge these types dispassionately. We belong ourselves by nature to one type or the other, and inevitably we are kinder about our own kith and kin. We shall see the obvious weakness and strength of each more clearly, in the light of New Testament principles. Meanwhile the two types are there as permanent and eternal types of human nature, 'while rock stands or water runs.'

2. *Compromise in human history.*—Human history being human character in action, we are not surprised to find in it abundant illustrations of both types. The uncompromising type is the revolutionary of human history, and we can see him again and again down the centuries from the prophet Amos to Liebknecht and Lenin, from the Zealot to the Bolshevist. On the whole he has appeared more often among the Latins and the Slavs and the Celts than in the other races. He finds a principle, and he applies it ruthlessly, relentlessly, remorselessly. In Russia the principle of Government of a class for a class has been uncompromisingly applied, first in the interest of the Romanoffs, and now in the interest of the proletariat, and in each case without regard for consequences. Similarly in France the principle of Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality had to be applied, though the heavens fell. The tense zeal of the American carried him to the goal of freedom in 1775 and 1865 at a price that was terribly heavy. We need not tarry to find further examples of this uncompromising, catastrophic revolutionary element in human nature expressed in human history.

Inevitably, too, there is the other element, the element of compromise, accommodation, evolution. That is most clearly illustrated in British history. The practical, the possible, the temporary expedient have been dominating considerations again and again. We have got off with one revolution, we have drifted into a huge colonial empire without ever evolving a colonial principle, or a theory of expansion. We have earned a reputation for justice and equity in our dealing with subject races that has never been surpassed, and yet we have never promulgated a cut-and-dried legal code, to be logically applied in all courts of justice. The Reformation in England, the Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church, countless arbitrations of industrial history, are all examples of the achievements of this type of human character.

Again, it is hard to speak dispassionately of either tendency, though nations and the past are more easily judged than living types, to which we have instinctive affinities or aversions. We can simply note their presence and influence in history, and go on to view the two tendencies, personal and historical, in the light of the Gospels and New Testament, and of the life and spirit and mind of Jesus Christ.

3. *Compromise and the New Testament.*—(*a*) The Gospels.—It is a commonplace to say that our Lord took human nature as He found it, and looked at human history without blinking facts. It is therefore to be expected that we find both elements in His view of history. There is certainly much in the Gospel records of the uncompromising. Again and again the imperious voice sounds out: 'He that is not with us is against us'; 'Let the dead bury their dead'; 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon'; 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish'; 'Except a man be born again'; 'Except ye turn, and become as little children'; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood'; 'Sell all that thou hast'; 'If any man will come after me, and hateth not his father, and mother, and brethren, he cannot be my disciple'; 'No man, who has put his hand to the plough, and turned back, is fit for the kingdom'; 'If thy brother will not hear thee, tell it to the church: and if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican.' And besides these individual warnings, there are all the terrible parables and pictures of uncompromising catastrophic judgments, relentless sundering verdicts, hard-and-fast clear lines between blessing and cursing, heaven and hell, 'Inasmuch as ye did it, come ye blessed . . . inasmuch as ye did it not, depart ye cursed.' Not for nothing have men spoken of Christ the uncompromising, the revolutionary.

But in addition and in direct contrast to this, there is a body of teaching which definitely suggests the other side of things. Christ tells a story of a

king counting his forces with the alternative of war or compromise. At another time He says the sons are free from taxation, but St. Peter must find the tribute, 'Lest we cause them to stumble.' He suggests a different standard for different people, 'All cannot receive it, but those to whom it is given.' 'Whosoever shall break one of these commandments, and shall teach men so, the same shall be least in the kingdom,' but not excluded from the kingdom. The wheat and tares must both grow together till the harvest, the drag-net gathers both good and bad, and temporarily nothing is done. There are times when even protest is out of place, 'He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall his voice be heard in the streets.' There are times for great and wide tolerance: 'The bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench'; 'He that is not against us is for us.' 'How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times? I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven.'

Similarly in the wider aspect of human history. It is often catastrophic, revolutionary, when on the earth there is distress of nations and perplexity, and men's hearts fail them for fear. But it is also evolutionary. In direct contrast to the parables and pictures of doom, there are also pictures of slow invisible forces making their way, steadily adapting, accommodating, insinuating, themselves, events 'wrought in the silence of God,' as Ignatius finely says.

We find a way out of the contradiction by remembering that the gospel if it is for all men and for all temperaments, must naturally contain many aspects of life, and that in fact is the first ray of light that we get. Our Lord has a message for both types of human nature, the compromising and the uncompromising, healing and rebuking their obvious weaknesses, and praising their obvious strength.

He meets the uncompromising in their obvious weakness. They are apt to be hard and fanatical and ruthless, 'Lord, shall we call down fire from heaven?' He speaks to them of the Son of Man, who comes not to destroy but to save, not to judge but to save, and shows them always the Divine patience, the Divine mercy, the Divine charity, 'Judge not: be ye merciful; it is lawful to do good and to save life on the sabbath-day.'

But He also meets them in their obvious strength. their courage, their fire, their zeal. And He seems to say to them, 'You are right in thinking that there are causes and people worth dying for.' A man must not live at all costs. 'Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more they can do.' The Crown of Revolution is Resurrection. The Son of Man, the uncompromising foe of hypocrisy and the wilfully darkened mind, shall be mocked and scourged and crucified, but the third day He shall rise again.

We can see Him too coming to the compromising, to heal and rebuke and exhort.

The weakness of compromise is again obvious. It is too slow, too tolerant. It often degenerates into camouflaged cowardice. Clearly the defect of all moral evolution is its pace, and we can see that our Lord has turned on it the searching stimulating light of the Cross; the permanent spur of moral progress, to alter the figure, is also the Cross. If it is true to speak of Time the great healer, if it is right to be patient and to trust that 'Somehow good will be the final goal of ill,' if 'he that believeth shall not make haste,' he that believeth must always have an open ear and alert conscience for that other great truth: 'If any man will come after me, let him ignore himself, and take up his cross daily and follow.'

Compromise, then, is criticized in its weakness: it is also praised in its strength, in its obvious patience and peaceableness, in its tolerance, which is at best a compound of faith and hope and charity. Men are to wait and watch and lend, never despairing. The patient shall win their souls, they shall endure to the end and be saved.

This twofold and apparently contradictory message is simply a living message for living people, and has to begin with men and women where it finds them. When we remember, further, that behind every word and prayer and act, there is the purpose of redemption, we need to ask no further question: we have seen ourselves, and know that Nicodemus was right; here is a teacher sent from God.

Does He at times seem terribly uncompromising? It is a redemptive severity. The one chance for some types is that a sharp stabbing severity shall sting them into life. Christ will bring a sword and send fire that He may also bring the abundant life, and leave to men the unworldly peace of the redeemed. Or does He seem sometimes curiously tolerant, curiously content to accept what He can get? Again it is the goodness of God leading men to repentance.

(*b*) The rest of the New Testament.—Inasmuch as the rest of the New Testament has the mind of Christ in all its highest moments, we shall expect to find the same two elements and attitudes that were dominant in the Gospels, and we are not disappointed.

The Pauline Epistles are the writings of one who claimed to have the mind of Christ, and his claim is justified in all that concerns this matter of compromise. St. Paul is to be found using both compromise and unyielding severity always with his Master's redemptive purpose. He is all things to all men that he may save some. So he exhorts to compromise in the Epistle to Philemon, or agrees to it as at the Council of Jerusalem, or urges it in advising about individual cases. But he is also at times quite uncompromising. He tells the Corinthians he has been severe with them because he loves them. He thunders against the very idea of a Christian lawsuit in a pagan court; he delivers men to Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme; he speaks plainly in uncompromising condemnation of certain vices. He makes one most emphatic and uncompromising compromise, 'I will eat no meat, while the world lasts, lest I cause my brother to offend.' So whether he comes with a rod or comes with mercy, he comes to save the brother for whom Christ died, and all his things are done with charity.

The Epistle to the Hebrews bears the same marks. Nothing could be more uncompromising than the break with Judaism. There is to be no return to the beggarly elements. The old covenant was to the writer 'much ado about nothing'; it could never save men from sin. On the other hand, the author understands the evolution of sacrifice in history and has no break to make with priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. Christ 'inherits' a name, something that had always been there, and is the first-born of many brethren. The readers of the letter face a crisis, no longer under the terrors of the inexorable trumpet voice of law, 'they are not come to a mountain that burned with fire,' but rather live in the spirit of the heroes and heroines, Jew and Gentile of chapter 11, the 'Anointed ones,' the 'Messiahs,' the 'Sons' of all ages.

The Johannine writings seem more uncompromising with their sharp sheer contrasts of love and hate, life and death, light and darkness. 'There is a sin unto death; not concerning this do I say he should make request.' But if the man who sins hath not seen Him, neither known Him, the man who says he has not sinned, the people who say they have no sin make God a liar. Obviously there is a suggestion of some need for accommodation, and the love which expresses itself in mercy throbs all through the Epistles, leaving a general impression that is by no means one of unrelieved uncompromising severity.

Similarly the Book of Revelation, in so far as it reflects its Jewish and apocalyptic ancestry, is of course uncompromising. Yet the Spirit who speaks to the Churches in the seven letters will accept 'a little faith,' and not to have denied the name is a ground for praise though it seems a somewhat negative achievement. Professor A. C. Welch has recently pointed out that the writer attempts a doctrinal compromise or reconciliation between the Jewish belief in the resurrection of the body and the Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

Such a brief review suggests that the writers of the New Testament lived in a difficult and changing world and had to make decisions from day to day. That naturally committed them to both the acceptance and refusal of compromise, but in every case and in every book there is always the same desire to save men and to bring them to the knowledge of the truth.

It is perhaps worth while to notice the bearing of these considerations on critical questions. Much recent criticism seems to seek consistency at all costs. The St. Paul of the Epistles is not the St. Paul of Acts. The man who wrote Galatians cannot also have accepted the compromise of the Jerusalem Council. The two adjacent paragraphs of St. Matthew 18—one speaking of forgiveness unto seventy times seven, and the other pursuing a quarrel to the point of excommunication—cannot both be genuine. Such a desire for consistency at all costs is surely excessive. There are times and occasions in all ages when opposites are not necessarily contraries, when inconsistency is a sign of both strength and wisdom, and such situations must plainly have arisen in Apostolic times. They were met not by any consistent and unvariable rule of thumb, but in the spirit and with the vision of the Love which will not let men go, and also will not let men off. If textual considerations make it evident that a passage of Gospel or Epistle is not genuine, there is nothing to be done but accept the evidence. But it is surely high time that the

practice was abandoned of rejecting passages only on the ground of inconsistency.

4. *Conclusions.*—In all deliberations as to the comparative wisdom of compromise or intransigeance the question must first and always be asked, which course will lead most to the redemption or progress or lasting good of the cause or principles or persons concerned? The test of both acceptance and refusal of compromise is its real inner purpose, and the only finally Christian purpose is redemption in the widest sense.

Any decision made must further be followed out in the spirit of charity. It is possible to compromise from lack of zeal or loyalty or courage, from mere torpor of mind or spirit, from mere lack of interest. It is also possible to refuse to compromise in a spirit of self-assertive cocksure arrogance, to exalt precept into principle, to confuse zeal for truth with animal temper. The surest, keenest zealot can never afford to forget St. Paul's great warning, 'Though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.'

One principle, the principle of redemption; one spirit, the spirit of charity, these seem but a slender equipment for one of life's perpetual problems. Often men long for more; often they would like an unvarying formula, a 'slide-rule,' as it were, of wisdom and morality to produce the perfect decision automatically and save them from the toilsome tasks of thought and resolution. Fortunately Christianity is not static but dynamic, not dead but alive. Not for nothing is the difficult teaching of the Gospels followed by the gift of the Spirit who shall guide men into all the truth. Happily men are under grace and not under the law. 'The golden rule is that there is no golden rule.' People and problems have to be met and weighed and judged one by one in the light of all the pertinent and attainable facts. At long last men have to say their prayers and make their choice and do their best—'*Veni Creator Spiritus.*'

Two pictures above all others have gripped the hearts of the Christian centuries. The first is the picture of the Madonna and Child, which suggests, perhaps fancifully, the accommodation, the adaptation of the Divine to human limitations, the compromise as it were of God with man, the mode of the Divine Immanence. The second is the picture of the Crucifixion, the Divine refusal to compromise with human sin, the mode of the Divine Transcendence. Each has its eternal message for varying human moods, the first tempering moments of hardness and impatience and superiority, the second healing cowardice and kindling courage. The messages vary, the word of appeal is for ever the same—'See that ye refuse not him that speaketh.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Recent Studies of Schleiermacher.[1]

Pfarrer Lehmann-Issel has sat at the feet of Professors Troeltsch and Wobbermin; their influence upon him is evident in this study of the relation between the objective and the subjective elements in religion. The author's purpose is to present a detailed criticism of Karl Dunkmann's *Die theologische Prinzipienlehre Schleiermachers* (1916), but reference is also made to other works by Dunkmann, especially his *Religionsphilosophie* (1917), which aims at showing the insufficiency of religious experience as a foundation for Christian theology. The contention of this work is that the respective conclusions of Dunkmann and Schleiermacher cannot be combined into one system, and in the course of an elaborate investigation much valuable information is given concerning the contributions made in recent years, by leading German theologians, to this ever-recurring theme.

The permanent value of Schleiermacher's writings is held to consist in his having been the first to direct attention to the new problems which the Renaissance made it incumbent upon theologians to face. He claimed that theology is entitled to a place within the circle of the sciences, and that Christianity is a religion among other religions,

[1] *Die Grenzen des objektiven Erkennens in der Theologie:* Eine Untersuchung über die Frage nach dem Wesen der Religion, von Lic. Kurt Lehmann-Issel, Pfarrer in Neuenweg (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs; pp. iv, 208).

though with unique characteristics. The modern theologian has access to far more extensive historical material than was available for Schleiermacher, who did, however, show that, to understand Christianity, it is essential to take into account not only the Bible, but also tradition and experience. The reason why different theological schools claim him as their founder is that he did not offer final solutions, but supplied stones for later theologians to use in the construction of their various systems. His two basal principles were that, on scientific grounds, Christianity cannot claim to be the only religion, and that experience proves it to be unique among religions.

Dunkmann's main contention is that Christianity is the only religion, because all other historical religions fail to realize fully the true ideal of religion. Lehmann-Issel charges him with arguing in a circle: on the one hand, saying that Christianity is true, because it corresponds to the ideal of religion; on the other hand, urging that the true ideal of religion is only to be found in Christianity. He maintains that Dunkmann's appeal to Schleiermacher involves an interpretation of his views which is diametrically opposed to the generally accepted estimate of his teaching. Schleiermacher, who is the founder of modern theology, becomes a supporter of the old Protestant orthodoxy. Dunkmann understands by religion the *idea* of religion, by science the *idea* of science, and by experience the *idea* of experience; thus he gives to all these words a different meaning from that which they have in Schleiermacher's writings. 'The deduction of an idea can never determine the reality and the truth of a psychological fact, and the deduction can never be an "experience."' Unlike Dunkmann, Schleiermacher never attempted to *deduce* religion; he assumes religious experience as a psychological fact, and analyses the religious consciousness.

In Lehmann-Issel's summary of the important section in which he deals with the varieties of religious phenomena in history, the significance of religious experience, and cognate themes, he affirms that the question 'What is religion?' raises a problem which cannot be solved except by scientific methods; but inasmuch as religious experience is also an historical fact, it must be compared with other phenomena. What we understand by religion is, at the outset, determined by our own experience; but, as our historical knowledge increases, the richer in content does our conception of religion become. In like manner, we discover what Christianity is from our own experience, as we compare it with the experience of the disciples of Christ as recorded in the New Testament, always bearing in mind that only when the Spirit of Christ pervades our own religious life can we truly know what is the essence of Christianity.

J. G. Tasker.

Handsworth College, Birmingham.

Deissmann's 'Licht vom Osten.'[1]

Dr. Deissmann tells us in his preface that the first leisure at his disposal after the War and the pressing duties which followed it was devoted to a thorough revision of this well-known and highly valued treatise. Its recognition had been attested by the appearance of three German and two English editions. He was asked to reprint it, and he set himself to discharge his responsibility with what one can only call an astounding thoroughness. The present reviewer has only had the opportunity of comparing this new fourth edition with the first German edition. The comparison is extraordinarily impressive. Practically every page, more especially in its footnotes, reveals the bringing up to date of the minutest points.

The plan and character of the book have not been altered, but with colossal industry exercised in a most distracting period, Dr. Deissmann seems to have let nothing relevant escape his notice. It would be useless to give examples. For no single page of the earlier edition seems to have remained unaltered. Books, articles, dissertations, private letters from experts, all are used to illuminate the subject. Also, the illustrations are enormously increased. The indexes are immensely elaborated. So that from every point of view the earlier editions are genuinely enriched.

It is needless to remind readers of this Journal of the unparalleled services which Dr. Deissmann has rendered to the investigation of the language of the New Testament, more especially in the light of the Papyri, Inscriptions, and Ostraka, which have become available in recent times. These constitute a province of scholarship which may well be called

[1] Fourth completely revised edition, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1923, pp. xvii, 447; 15s. 3d., bound, 20s. 4d.

his own. This new edition of his famous book makes students of the New Testament more emphatically his debtors than ever.

We are delighted to learn from his preface how much labour he has spent on the restoration of friendly relations among the nations. And one can only think of this new edition of *Licht vom Osten* as bringing Christian scholars of every race and tongue to sit anew at his feet.

H. A. A. Kennedy.

New College, Edinburgh.

In the Study.

An Evening Prayer.

O God, Bless now and always, we pray Thee, the services of Thy House, and wherever Christian people have this day raised their desires unto Thee, do Thou hearken unto them, O Lord. Spare in Thy great mercy all who have offended Thee this day. Have pity upon the children of darkness who misuse the night for their own evil purposes, and let them not continue in the folly of their ways. Grant that those who have quarrelled or complained this day may not let the sun go down upon their wrath or discontent. Do Thou guide aright the traveller on his way, and protect and provide for all the helpless. Heal the sick, if it be Thy holy will, and comfort all who mourn. For those who cannot sleep through suffering of mind or body, do Thou shorten the hours of darkness by Thy presence. Watch with loving care, we beseech Thee, over all our absent kindred and friends, guiding their steps in the ways of security, righteousness, pleasantness and peace. Guard Thou the aged and the little ones; and whether this night be like all the past ones to us, or to any of Thy people anywhere the last, grant that we may all alike be found safe in Thy gracious keeping, and so bring us, Heavenly Father, in Thine own time and way out of this world of darkness and change into Thine Eternal light and rest and peace, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

Virginibus Puerisque.

An awfully Big Adventure.[1]

'Keep cool, keep awake. Your enemy the devil prowls like a roaring lion, looking out for someone to devour.'—1 P 5^{8} (Moffatt's translation).

Do you ever feel that somehow you have been born at the wrong time altogether; that you are dreadfully unlucky to be here when things seem to be so deadly dull and stale and slow compared with what they used to be in the old story-book days? You are deep in some exciting tale that won't let you sleep at night—about the French Revolution, or the Cavaliers, or the wars of Prince Charlie, and of how some lucky beggar of a boy, no bigger than you, got mixed up in the very centre of it all, and had such glorious adventures, and escapes so narrow that you breathe hard even when you read of them, and he went through it all! Or else it is some girl who, when everything seemed over and the enemy triumphant, outwitted them ever so cleverly, and they were baffled after all—all through a girl as young as you! And then you waken up, and, after that, real life, your life, seems drab and tame and unexciting, like a wet Saturday afternoon when you have played all the games, and read all the books, and still it pours, and there is nothing left to do except glue your nose flat to the window pane and wish that it were time for tea! Nothing really big and creepy ever happens to you. You know how the books open. 'A lonely and bespattered horseman was riding slowly through the fading light,' and before you turn the page he has ridden straight into all kinds of exciting things—that sudden scuffle in the dark when, from under the shadow of the great trees, they leap out on him, and he is down; that eerie inn out on the lonely moors where in the silence, when the very night seems listening, he hears a knife being sharpened in the next room, and then some one softly tries the handle of his door. And there are duels; and a mad leap for life, and the horse just does it; and heaps more adventures, all tumbled together! In these days it seems a boy couldn't stroll down a common street without running into dozens of them. But when you turn a corner there is never anything better than a dog chasing a cat, and you're lucky if you see even that!

Surely things have grown dreadfully old, and tired, and not nearly so interesting as they used to

[1] By the Rev. A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

be! I don't know about that. Exciting things still leap out on one sometimes suddenly enough. Once, when I was a lad, and walking down a quiet street, three little ladies ran out and cried they were so glad to see me, and would I throw a burglar out of their house! With some exaggeration I said that I would be very pleased, and they gave me a candle, and I started searching, with the sure feeling that very soon somebody was going to be tumbling down the stair, and that somebody was going to be me! As it turned out there was no burglar; but that was not too bad for a quiet lad, one quiet evening in a quiet street. In any case, life can be still tremendously exciting; and many people, Christ's people, have the most thrilling adventures every day. When Christ was here He used to tell folk that, if they were going to be on His side, they would have a wild, splendid time of it, and that there was no use of any one thinking of it at all unless they were prepared to stand rough weather, and to take knocks, unless they had grit and pluck and a big heart. It's going to be gloriously exciting, so He said, and added, 'That's why I am so sure that you will come; you couldn't possibly keep out of this!' And it is exciting, the nice kind, like the last five minutes of that football match when the other side were on your line and all but over, and they just kept them out, and could they manage? Ah! they're in! But no! He's down, just outside the line. And you shouted yourself hoarse, and couldn't keep still, and loved every minute of it. Well, it's like that. Didn't you know, and did you really think that it was dull and stale? Anything but that! The men in the Testament keep telling us how thrilling it is. It's like a soldier on campaign watching in an outpost in No Man's Land, all his nerves listening. What's that, was it a twig snapping? Or, like a boxing match against some great strong bully, and you have to be clever and very watchful all the time or he will floor you. Or, like a race, the last ten yards, and it's neck and neck, and one must go all out to win. Or, here is Peter saying it's like being out in the jungle, knowing that a lion is quite close, though where, you aren't just sure. And you crouch near the fire, and heap on brushwood to scare him, and daren't doze over even for a second. There he is roaring; that means he is going to spring. Is it at me? Steady now! It's as exciting as that.

But what does he mean? There is no lion in your house. Mother wouldn't let him in; she makes fuss enough when you bring home some stray puppy, or half a dozen rabbits; would never allow a lion to prowl about her nice clean house with its great wet paws? But, of course, he means temptations, those horrid things that are always hunting us, and that leap at us so quickly, when we never knew that they were anywhere near; that seize and carry us off, and worry us, and maul us. They do come dreadfully suddenly, don't they; and it is never safe to forget about them, is it? A man lately was telling us in a book of how he went shooting; and crawling along a narrow ledge of rock, with a sheer height above him and a deeper one below him, he turned a corner, and came face to face with a leopard, I think it was, that crouched to spring. And his heart went pit-a-pat, and he could only stare at the two great, green, glaring eyes; but his revolver fired of itself, and one of the two eyes went out, for he had shot straight into it. And with that the great beast sprang at him, and all but swept him with it down, down, down to a horrible death far below. And it was all so sudden and so unexpected, that the man stood trembling and dizzy and sick. And sometimes you are playing a game merrily, and all at once temper leaps out at you from nowhere: or you get into a hole at school, and in the flurry, before you realize what you are doing, you have said something not quite straight. You are not thinking about danger, turn a bluff of rock, and there is a leopard with its glaring eyes! It's terribly exciting. Indeed you will not manage at all by yourselves.

In South Africa there was a native village where every night a man-eating lion seized on some one. They built traps, and it broke them; they tried to scare it, kept awake, shouted and made huge fires; but always there came a wail, and somebody was gone, night after night. And at last a great British hunter heard of it, and took pity on them, and travelled hundreds of miles, and said, 'I'll get him for you'; and he did. And you do your best, but these great prowling brutes, temptations, are too strong and far too clever for you; and they beat you down time after time. Ah! but there is a mighty hunter, Jesus Christ, who has heard about it, and has come from very, very far to help you. Your traps aren't strong enough, your little bows and arrows can't stop these big beasts' rush. Although you try to keep awake, you doze and then they get you. Ask Jesus Christ, and He will keep you safe. Ask Him to help you and He will. It

will still be gloriously exciting, one long 'awfully big adventure,' but with Him beside you, you need have no fear, no fear at all.

Sunshine, Twelve Hours.[1]

'Let your light shine.'—Mt 5^{16}.

Clever men have made instruments for measuring the sunshine, so that you can know how much of it there was on any given day. Some of the simplest of them are something like this. There is a little glass ball, and when the sun strikes on it, it gets hot, and burns a small black mark on paper that is behind it: and, as a clock ticks, this paper, which has the hours and the minutes and the seconds printed on it, moves, so that the mark becomes a narrow line along it. But, when the sun is hidden, the glass ball grows cold, and nothing happens to the paper then. So that, when evening comes, you have a record of the day. See! It was beautiful sunshine right on until twelve o'clock, but at twenty to one a big cloud spread across the sky, but only for ten minutes, for look here, the burnt line begins again. At three the sun was lost, and never showed again, except just for a second or two at about half-past six. It's all set down, and can be read at any time. It's like the books at school, where the good days and the bad days are all marked. You can't remember what you did on a night four months ago, but the books show. That day you had a headache; or was it a splendidly exciting story some one lent you? anyway you didn't stick in to your work, but scamped things, and fell badly in the class, sank down to twenty-seven: or that other night when you got tired of that, and made up your mind that you were going to stick in again, and you went up to third or fourth. It's all there in the books; and if Dad were to ask the master how you have been getting on, he could look up and say, 'Well, during December he was fairly idle, but he has been doing really well since then.'

And so they keep a record of the sunshine of the bright days and the dull, of the gold hours and the grey, of the places that get lots of sun and those that don't. And any morning in the paper you will find where the sun was shining the day before, and for how long—Brighton, thirteen hours; Greenock, one second, it may be; somewhere else, nil.

You, too, have got a sunshine gauge, and I wonder what your one shows—dull days or bright ones, happiness or grumps? There are some boys and girls so merry and good-humoured, with such a knack of making other people happy, that they are like a ray of sunshine; and, when they go back to school, things get very dreary for those left behind, and mother misses them just dreadfully, and, as they said about a cheery laddie long ago, 'The village seems asleep or dead, now Lubin is away.' That is what people felt about Jesus Christ. When they were with Him they all felt cheery and happy-hearted, for life was a fine thing, full of sunshine. One of them tells us that to him it was like this. In the old days he had often been out at night on the lake fishing, and sometimes it was cruelly cold, and they were wet through with rain and spray, and the winds cut them to the very bone, and it was all horrid and miserable. But the sun rose. And what a difference that made. Their clothes dried, they grew warm, their fingers, not stiff any longer, could haul at the nets and at the ropes, and they got on; their spirits soared up like a singing bird, they laughed and jested, and sang and grew quite cheery again. And since Jesus came, and as long as I am with Him, there are no dull days. For He is like the sunshine—hours and hours of it the whole day long, and never a cloud hiding it; and one is always happy all the time.

I wonder what your gauge shows to-day? Is there that burnt mark running along the paper, or is the ball quite cold? Perhaps you have had a rather bad day so far, were late in getting up (and why is it that it is only when one is in a hurry that buttons come off and things break?). Perhaps when you were about finished dressing, you found something on the chair that ought to be down near the skin, and had to strip and start again, and porridge was cold, and mother said you had to take it; and you were late again when they were going off to church (who is it hides your cap just when you want to make up time?); and yesterday you couldn't get to the match for it was too wet and cold, and you've been sitting here in church nursing that sore, and sulking over it—no, the paper seems unmarked so far, never a blink of sunshine. Ah, well, it's early yet, and, if you want, you can still have many hours of it before the evening comes. It looks like a wet afternoon, but it can be quite summery and bright inside. Be decent and play with the wee ones, and you will really find it first-rate fun, for baby says such odd things, and a

[1] By the Rev. A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

tea-time you'll be telling them to mother, and shouting over them. Make up your mind that you're not going to growl because you must stay in, and you'll find heaps of jolly things to do indoors. It's only half-past eleven yet. If the sun comes out now, your day may still show 'sunshine, eight hours—not too bad after all, with such a horrid morning! But if you want to have it all day long, remember as soon as you waken to run to your friend Jesus Christ, and stay beside Him, as near to Him as you can; for beside Him it is always midsummer, and the flowers are always out, and the birds are always singing, and day by day the gauge shows, 'Sunshine, twelve hours.'

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

God walking in the Garden.

'And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou?'—Gn $3^{8.9}$.

Is this history or is it parable? Is it an incident in the life of one man and woman, or is it something that might happen to any of us? The writer wants to express the fact that we have fellowship with God. How could he have expressed it better than by saying that God walks with men? We understand the figure at once. We see the beauty of the idea—God walks with man in the garden in the cool of the day. But do we find God with us in our gardens? T. E. Brown has a famous poem about a garden and God's place in it.

A garden is a lovesome thing, God wot!
Rose plot,
Fringed pool,
Ferned grot—
The veriest school
Of peace; and yet the fool
Contends that God is not—
Not God! in gardens! when the eve is cool?
Nay, but I have a sign;
'Tis very sure God walks in mine.

There are three great truths in the text.

1. Men are made for the enjoyment of God's company. That is expressed by the words 'they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day.' That is one of the greatest truths that we can know. If we do not know it, it may be said that we know nothing, for it explains both creation and redemption. It explains why the world was made by God at first and why the Son of God came into the world afterwards to redeem it. We are made to enjoy God's company. How can we enjoy it? Just as Adam and Eve enjoyed it. They walked with God in the garden. That is to say, they thought of Him in the midst of their work and their pleasure.

But there is another way in which we may enjoy His presence, His company—that is, in direct worship, whether public or private. We have one day in seven set apart for the purpose. If we hear the voice of God when we walk in our gardens, we are certain to hear His voice still more clearly when we worship in His House. We read the 'Word of God' as we call it—that is just another way of saying we hear God's voice in the Bible. And what are we doing when we pray to God but just holding fellowship with Him? This is the very best definition of prayer that can be given—it is holding communion, or fellowship, with God.

But I think we may fairly look upon praise as enjoying God's company just as truly as the reading of the word or prayer. When we sing our psalm or our hymn we understand that He is hearing us. What would be the use of singing them if He did not hear us when we sing? Many of the psalms and hymns are direct prayers, and have no meaning whatever unless it is true that God is listening to us while we sing them.

Lead us, heavenly Father, lead us
O'er the world's tempestuous sea;
Guard us, guide us, keep us, feed us,
For we have no help but Thee.

And many of the psalms, and many of the hymns too, express the enjoyment of God's presence. Take, for example, the Scottish metrical version of the 100th Psalm:

All people that on earth do dwell,
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice.
Him serve with mirth, His praise forth tell,
Come ye before Him and rejoice.

In short, every act of worship is meant to recognize the nearness of God, His readiness to hear us, and our pleasure in His company. We walk and talk with God in the sanctuary.

2. But now we come to the words, 'they hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden.' Here is a complete change. Something has evidently gone wrong. What is it? It is the same thing that has gone wrong with every one of us. Adam and Eve have sinned—they have been selfish; they have thought of themselves and not of God; they have preferred their own will to God's will, choosing the way that was right in their own eyes without thinking whether or not it was right in the eyes of God. Sin is simply selfishness. Adam and Eve can no longer enjoy God's presence. Instead of enjoyment, what we now see them showing is shame and fear and hiding. These are the three things that regularly follow upon sin. In this story, which is so wonderfully told in the third chapter of Genesis, the *shame* of Adam and Eve is expressed by the idea of their nakedness. It was not nakedness of the body that troubled them, but nakedness of the soul. They knew that God saw right into them; their conscience told them that, as it tells every one of us. They could no longer look God in the face. But conscience not only makes us ashamed, it makes cowards of us. 'Conscience doth make cowards of us all.' Adam confessed that; 'I was afraid,' he said. We are not always manly enough even to confess it. But whether we confess it or not, *fear* is an inevitable result of sin. The third result of sin is *hiding*. They hid themselves among the trees of the garden. This is a very common result of sin. When we sin against God we are always trying to hide ourselves. What are the trees that we hide amongst? Sometimes it is pleasure. We try to drown our conscience by going in for all kinds of enjoyment. Sometimes it is work. We must not give ourselves time to think, and so we keep ourselves busy. But whatever it is we try to hide behind, it is all in vain. Adam and Eve could not hide themselves from God among the trees of the Garden of Eden, and we cannot hide ourselves from Him among the trees of work or pleasure or anything else, however thick their leaves may be.

3. But now comes the best part of the whole story. When God says, 'Where art thou?' we think He has come to condemn us, but He has come for no such purpose. He has come to redeem us. He does not need to condemn us, because our own hearts have condemned us long ago; we condemn ourselves. Christ Himself tells us that He did not come into the world as a judge. He came as a Saviour. 'I came not to judge the world, but to save it.' And He saves it by the power of love.

When Christ came into the world He came saying, 'Where art thou?' When you read the story of His life you find that He went about seeking the *lost*.

Now this was done out of love. You will never understand the meaning of the coming of Christ into the world until you see that it was due to the love of God. If there is one text in the Bible that you must know by heart it is the text, 'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.' In order to convince them that He came into the world not to condemn it but to save it, Jesus had to spend His whole life going about doing good, healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, raising the dead. And even then they did not realize that it was all for love that He had come into the world. They did not realize it until at last He willingly died for the world. Then they came to understand what He meant when He said, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'

Now the purpose of Christ in coming into the world was to restore us to the enjoyment of God's presence. And that can only be done by love. For we cannot enjoy the presence of God unless we love Him; and we love, as John says, 'because he first loved us.' What is the effect of the love of Christ upon us? How does it bring us back into the enjoyment of His company?

First of all, it rouses in us a sense of sin. Sin, as we have seen, is selfishness. Now you will never drive selfishness out of people by condemning them; you will only do it by loving them. For it is only when they see your love that they see their own selfishness.

Then the next step is that we are sorry for our sin. As soon as the Prodigal saw that he had been selfish in taking all that belonged to him and spending it in riotous living he was sorry for it. 'Father,' he said, 'I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight and am no more worthy to be called thy son.' It was the father's love that made the Prodigal feel sorry. It was the love of God that made David sing those wonderful penitential psalms.

And then, last of all, comes our response to the love of God. 'We love because He first loved us.' 'Where art thou?' is no doubt the question of the righteous judge from whose eye no tree in the garden

can hide us; but it is also the voice of the compassionate Father who Himself comes down from heaven to look for His lost one.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Concerning Giving.

'Let each man do according as he hath purposed in his heart; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.'—2 Co 9^7.

1. *The root of a fine beneficence.*—The practical precepts found in the text emerge out of the Infinite. They suck their nutriment from the very heart of God. The soil in which they grow is that of profound devotion. Look at the soil of this particular Epistle to the Corinthians—at the fifth or sixth chapter, or give patient examination to this rare representative portion of the eighth chapter, 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich'; or take the culmination of this ninth chapter, 'Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift.'

Paul's own liberality is always a fruit, and never a work, and it is the product of his communion with the Eternal. First of all, he had passed through a mighty spiritual experience which he can only describe as a transition from darkness to light. That glorious emancipation had made him the love-slave of his Deliverer, and he watched with vigilant love-eyes for the faintest indication of his Master's will. 'The love of Christ constraineth me!' And out of this liberty of the love-slave there emerges a spontaneous and fervent gratitude which expresses itself in every form of liberal and bountiful service. Paul was a great giver because he had so greatly received. Paul's liberality can be traced to Calvary; all his giving had its roots at the Cross.

2. *The nature of a fine beneficence.*

(1) The negative aspects. There is an absence of grudging. That is a very expressive word, and its real content is given in the margin, where we find the alternative phrase 'of sorrow.' That is to say, there are some people whose giving is 'of sorrow,' as though they were in pain, and the transaction is done to the accompaniment of sighs and groans. It is not that the gift is withheld; it is that it comes so reluctantly, as though some heart-strings were snapping in the passage. And what is the explanation? Just this: the soul is wedded to a thing instead of to an ideal, and the extraction of the thing is an agonizing divorce.

Dr. John Hall puts the matter thus: 'It is a shame for a rich Christian to be like a Christmas-box, that receives all, and out of which nothing can be got till it is broken in pieces.'

And then the apostle mentions a second negative characteristic; true liberality is not 'of necessity.' By this phrase he most clearly implies that there are people who give just because they are compelled to give. Their liberality is a 'forced' product, and, like all forced things, lacks nature's matured sweetness and charm. Social conventions can exercise a compulsion which elicits apparent liberality. Some people give because others are giving, and it will not pay to be out! Such liberality is like the slip of paper lying in the railway track, snatched up in the suction of a passing train and whirled along in the path of a common destiny. This liberality is caught in fashionable currents, and transiently moves 'of necessity.' Now the apostle teaches that no such small 'necessity' characterizes the Christian grace. It does not give because it must, it gives because it wants to. Its constraint is the gentle constraint of devotional love.

(2) But the apostle leaves these merely negative and somewhat colourless attributes and proceeds to more positive characteristics. True liberality is simple, having been *born in the 'heart.'* It is not engendered in the regions of calculation and expediency, but in that deep, elementary, vibratory region, the abode of the sympathetic chords of the life. There can be no fine liberality if these are untouched and unstirred.

But let no one imagine that the apostle is proclaiming the intended domination of blind emotions. True liberality is inclusive of both emotion and *understanding*. The basal sympathy is to express itself in intelligent purpose. 'According as he hath purposed in his heart.' Christian graces are not blind dispositions; they are lit up by the ministry of a vigilant understanding.

Further, this virtue of liberality is not only simple and intelligent, it is *warmed through and through with a most genial heat*—'God loveth a cheerful giver!' Can there be any more gracious and welcome experience than this one of having to do the King's business with a man whose heart is stirred and whose purpose is clear, and who just baptizes you with sunshine that he has caught from the countenance of his Lord? And yet, after all, there is a more delightful experience than so gracious

a meeting with this so gracious a man, and that is, to be the man, with our own hearts stirred like harp chords, and our own purpose clear with the counsels of the Almighty, and our own sunlit face throwing reflected beams of cheery goodwill upon every form of noble enterprise.

3. Now, if this high quality of liberality is to be manifested in our life, there are one or two matters to which we must give attention, altogether apart from those primary and radical conditions to which we referred at the outset.

(1) *The spirit of liberality requires to be kept informed.* To deny the information is to refuse the requisite incitement. Liberality works through certain prepared conditions, and one of the requisite conditions is that we should provide it with news. There will be no liberality where nothing is known: and therefore next to our knowledge of God we require the facts of human life.

(2) But even facts themselves may lie in the mind as infertile as marbles in a boy's pocket. If facts are to become operative and incentive, our *imaginations must be brought to play upon them.* If we could see conditions as they are in the overcrowded parts of our great cities, if we could imaginatively enter into their inner significances, significances that cannot be told in speech, and if we could track some of their far-reaching relationships, and open out these stubborn facts like the opening of a chestnut burr, everybody's liberality would leap to the enterprise of institutional work. And what applies to this applies to the entire field of Christian service. We must get to know the insides of our facts, and we must use every available means to obtain the knowledge.

(3) But even with all this the heart would still be exposed to the most insidious snares. There are people who are most unquestionably in Christ, and who even exercise such imaginations as we have tried to describe, and yet, through lack of ordinary business arrangement, their giving is marked by niggardliness and stint. No liberality will continue generous and ready and cheery unless there is some *basal and systematic arrangement.* In the old Jewish dispensation the brotherhood of God's people were commanded to set aside one-tenth of their income for unselfish service. But in the case of men of affluence, this is by no means an adequate proportion. A man with a thousand a year ought not to be contented with the consecration of a tenth. He should rather follow the example of one conspicuously wealthy man in our country, who began in very humble circumstances, and who in his comparative poverty systematically assigned a tenth for service, but he increased the proportion with the increase of his wealth, and he now assigns one-third to the service of his fellows and his Lord.

Let us set aside a certain proportion, determining that proportion in the very presence of our Lord. And what will be the effect? In the first place, it will save us from the peril of assuming we have given more money than we really have. There are some people who unfortunately estimate their liberality by the number of appeals that are made to them, and not by their responses. And systematic giving will save us further from countless worries and petty casuistries. We shall not have to be continually arguing with ourselves, and pleading with ourselves, and excusing ourselves. No, there will be the simple inquiry: There are our resources, and here is the appeal: can it be met?

And, last of all, *systematic giving makes liberality a delight.* To go to our consecrated money is like having a private bank in which we can draw for the work of the Lord.

'God loveth' such a giver! What an inheritance! What a baptism! Such a man lives in the love of the Almighty. It is enough. In this divine good, life will reach its consummation and its crown. The man is even now 'for ever with the Lord.'[1]

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Failure.

'And Simon answering said unto him, Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing.'—Lk 5^5.

Many of the personal incidents in the lives of our Lord and His disciples light up, like transparencies, with vivid spiritual instruction. One of these is that most suggestive experience of Peter and Andrew and the two sons of Zebedee, when they 'toiled all the night' with their nets and drew in nothing. That long night's work—and probably hard work too—meant failure. Peter's sad words, 'Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing,' might be written under the history of more than one human undertaking.

In common with the man of the world, the Christian suffers by the failure of earthly hopes and mundane prospects. His dreams perish. His plans

[1] J. H. Jowett, *The Transfigured Church*, 241.

miscarry. The child of God is not exempt in this respect from a share in the common experience of mankind. He labours for some earthly prize, but another carries it off. He plants a vineyard, but another eats the fruit.

But beyond this liability to failure in the concerns of this life, the Christian is exposed to the consciousness of failure in a domain which the worldly know nothing of. The worldly man can experience a sense of failure only in the narrow concerns of this world; his theatre of hope and action is contracted; but the Christian is exposed to the bitterness of failure in the vaster concerns of the spiritual world, in the loftier dreams of holiness, and in the Christly standard of self-denying service.

As a Christian, he obtains a new conception of the majesty and solemnity of life; he sees a new vision of his purpose in existence; he realizes the supreme beauty of holiness, as well as the obligation he is under to make it his final goal; he perceives a new standard of life altogether—the life of service, in the place of the old worldly life of self-pleasing. New spiritual faculties are created in him, new perceptions, new desires. The Holy Spirit implants within him a new set of spiritual instincts which demand to be satisfied by earnest self-culture and whole-hearted service. And just in proportion as this conception of a wider, ampler, nobler life comes to the Christian, so does it open a new and wider door for the entrance of failure and disappointment.

1. He is acutely conscious of failure in his devotions. Prayer seems so unheard and mechanical at times. He prays and prays, and yet no answer comes out of the silence. Or his thoughts refuse to centre themselves on God. And even when they obey the strong authority of the will and cease to wander, how hard it is to realize that one's prayer has been breathed straight into the ear of a Personal and Loving Father. We have sought communion with our Father, and yet we feel that we have failed.

But have we failed? Was the prayer of the Syro-Phœnician a failure when the Master passed on in silence and answered her never a word? Did she turn to go home broken-hearted, and say to her afflicted daughter, 'I have failed!' No; she won her way through that barrier of cutting silence, and only cried again in greater earnestness. Is she not utterly crushed by Christ's reply? No; she takes the very words of the Saviour and turns their point against Himself. 'Truth, Lord; yet even the dogs are not left to starve. They are allowed the droppings of the table. This is all I ask.' Then her cloud broke and the sunshine poured into her heart. Then the Master's meaning was clear. 'O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.' What had looked like failure was only a discipline of love. She received the boon she had craved for her child, but she received a greater blessing still in her own nature.

2. And in our self-culture, also, the element of failure is prominent; we seem to make no progress. We are tripped up to-day by the same temptation that proved so dangerous twenty or thirty years ago. We have spent all our days grubbing up the same weeds in the garden of the soul, but they are growing still.

Is our self-culture a failure because it seems so unprogressive? It may be that we are not making much advance along the line of conflict with some one besetting sin, and yet gradually but surely that very conflict, with all its apparent failures, is developing our moral character in some other direction. We are perhaps endeavouring to overcome the fiery temper that causes us so much shame and self-reproach. But, alas! our battles with it seem to be more often lost than won. This is bad—very bad—yet we may discern a soul of goodness even in our present evil. Is not that oft-lost battle affecting powerfully the other side of our nature and lowering our pride? How harsh we used to be in our censures upon others when they sinned! Ah, it is not so now. We take kindlier, tenderer views of their failings to-day. And as we grow in meekness we grow in influence. Thus our oft-mourned failure may be a hidden victory. The passionate temper which is left like 'a thorn in the flesh' to buffet us may be developing the beauty of meekness in us daily, and endowing us with the powers of attraction which humility and tenderness and compassion always exercise over other men.

3. We are conscious of failure in our service too. The souls we try to win seem just as indifferent, just as callous as ever. We see no token of success.[1]

Surely we have all shared the depression of the fruitless morning. We have all known something of that weary home-trudging when we have

[1] G. A. Sowter, *Trial and Triumph*, 127.

nothing to show for our toil. Gilmour in his diary in Mongolia moans again and again because he has no proofs of successful labour. And many a minister among the poor, and, still more, many a minister among the rich, has the same disheartening mornings after heavy and laborious nights. They toil, and toil, and they have nothing to record; and next week finds them washing their nets, returning again to the waters, and going home again with empty hands.

But is Christian service a failure because we see no results? Surely not. The man who leads a sinner out of the gloom into the clear shining of the Saviour's redeeming love may be only completing the work of other servants of Christ who have taught and warned and pleaded and prayed in former days.

Yet when we appear to be meeting only failure in our service, we must examine ourselves and see if there has been any defect or needless incompetency in our methods of work. Were we as skilful and tactful as we might have been? Did we let out the nets with discerning prudence? Or did we just throw them out in thoughtless heaps? Can we humbly say that, 'as much as is in us,' we did our duty?

4. But whether the failure be real or only apparent, we should note the virtue which resides in continued obedience to God. 'And when he had left speaking he said unto Simon, Put out into the deep and let down your nets for a draught.' And Peter obeyed in spite of defeat. And now let us enunciate a great law in human life. Obedience to the Master releases divine energy. Our disobedience always imprisons the energies of God. Obedience liberates imprisoned energies, and we never just know when the liberated energy will wear the last obstacle down and make us grandly triumphant.

Sixth Sunday after Trinity.

The Open Door.

'Behold, I have set before thee an open door.'—Rev 3^{8}.

1. Sir William Ramsay says that the 'open door' refers to the exceptional opportunities for Christian service which its geographical position had put in the way of the church at Philadelphia. 'Philadelphia,' he says, 'lay at the upper extremity of a long valley which opens back from the sea. After passing Philadelphia the road along this valley ascends to the Phrygian land and the great Central Plateau, the main mass of Asia Minor. This road was the one which led from the harbour of Smyrna to the north-eastern parts of Asia Minor and the East in general, the one rival to the great route connecting Ephesus with the East, and the greatest Asian trade-route of mediæval times.

The Imperial Post Road from Rome to the Provinces farther east and south-east coincided for some considerable distance with this trade-route. Through Troas, Pergamum, Thyatira, it reached Sardis; and from thence it was identical with the trade-route by Philadelphia up to the centre of Phrygia. Along this great route the new influence was steadily moving eastwards from Philadelphia in the strong current of communication that set from Rome across Phrygia towards the distant East. . . .

Philadelphia, therefore, was the keeper of the gateway to the plateau; but the door had now been permanently opened before the Church, and the work of Philadelphia had been to go forth through the door and carry the gospel to the cities of the Phrygian land.'[1]

2. But the words of the text do more than speak to the local circumstances of an individual church in the centuries long ago. They are of universal significance. And they mean that there is a great field of service at our gate to-day. 'What a fine field! What a fine field!' Dr. Guthrie was heard to say as he looked down from one of the Edinburgh bridges over the crowded closes and wynds that formed part of his parish.

And there is an open door abroad also. In the early days of the missionary movement the great prayer our fathers used to offer was the prayer for 'open doors,' because vast countries like India and China were practically closed against the Christian missionary and his message. But the prayer for 'open doors' has become superfluous. Every door has in the course of the decades become open to us.

3. Again the words of the text mean more than that there is a fine field here and abroad. They contain the Christian philosophy of life. They tell us of how God deals with His children, both of what He gives and of what He demands. And they are true to the whole spirit of Christ's gospel, which for all of us is the supreme illumination of that great theme.

[1] *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, 404.

What does God do for men, what does He give? Where are the limits to be drawn between what God does for man and what He wills that man shall do for himself? The answer to that question can be given with some confidence. God gives His truth to men; there it is for us to read and ponder in an open Book. God reveals Himself to men, and that too is shown us in the Book of His truth. God unveils before the eyes of men a purpose for all human life, setting upon men the seal of their childhood to God. God prepares a Kingdom for men, ordering life in such a way that they are able to realize the highest possibilities of their natures. God promises His help to men in their struggle against all the weakness inherent in their natures and against all hardship in outward circumstance.

But then God stops, and the Divine Voice says, 'Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it, but thou thyself must enter in.' That is the message of the gospel in brief and general terms. There is the outline of what God gives and does, and there also is the point at which He waits for the co-operation of man's own energies. God will do anything short of invading the sphere ruled by man's own choice. He prepares the Kingdom for him, sets forth the laws which must govern its life, promises help to the man who needs it. There is the open door which no man can shut. But the man must enter in by an act of his own will. Over that threshold no one shall pass like a slave in the grip of superior power; every one who enters at all shall walk like a free man.

Man is made free both by what God does and by what God refuses to do. And both those kinds of freedom are suggested in the words of our text. There is first of all the freedom of the open door, the kind of freedom which is only possible because of what God gives and does. God makes life an open door for all His children. If it were a closed door, if there were no answer to the hopes and desires of the soul, if no Kingdom were prepared, we should be slaves indeed. I can imagine no more bitter slavery in the world than creatures with great hopes, but with every door of fulfilment closed and barred. God's assurances and promises are the opened doors of life, freedom to aspire and to hope, life a broad place with space for the soul to breathe. That is the glorious liberty of the children of God.

Then also there is the freedom of the uncompelled entrance, the freedom which is ours because of what God refuses to do. He will not make us enter the inheritance He has prepared. No force will be exercised to bring men in. The gates will always be open, but there must always be a gate, a threshold which can be crossed only by an act of will and effort.

Now in this emphasis upon freedom Christianity stands midway, as it were, between a certain kind of pessimism and a certain kind of optimism. There is a brand of pessimism which closes all the doors of life. It makes life a prison-house of mechanical cause and effect; we are all the products of impersonal forces working blindly to an unknown end. There is no freedom of choice for us here in this world; all our decisions are the result of past choices, and at any given moment we can do no other than we actually do.

As against this pessimism Christianity proclaims the gospel of the open door. There is a certain kind of optimism also, which seems, though not perhaps to the same extent, to limit the freedom of man and to sap his sense of responsibility. This order of thought suggests that there is something deeply embedded in the scheme of things which is working towards progress. Evolution it interprets as an unfolding of this good, as though events must work in that direction whether man wills it or not.

Christianity is as deeply opposed to that facile optimism as to the gloom of absolute pessimism. It discovers no evidence in history that things move forwards inevitably towards a beneficent end. It sees, on the contrary, that immediately human effort relaxes degeneration begins to set in.

There are ages of decay when progress receives a check and old battles have to be fought all over again. That is the Christian reading of history, and as against any idle trust in the tendency of events to do what we want for us, Christianity flings upon man working in union with God the burden of the world's good.

In relation to the world situation to-day the two tendencies in thought which we have already described will be found asserting themselves. There are some who say that we are involved in the chain of stern necessity. All that we can do is to look on as spectators while mighty forces which we are powerless to control mould the world which our children will inherit. Others there are who from an opposite standpoint wonder what God is doing and look to Him to interfere in the order

of events, and are often reduced to doubt because of His silence.

What has Christianity to say to the heart of the age? It can only reassert its teaching that man is free, that the world has an open door before it, if it will only summon faith and courage to enter.

The message of the Church to men is, the Kingdom is prepared for you, the issue is in your own hands, but you yourselves must believe and obey and enter in.

4. We must pass from these wider applications to that region of personal life in which a message like this becomes even more real. And once again it is the two notes of freedom which speak to us. All God's doors are opened for us. The promises and invitations of the Scriptures, the picture of life triumphing over all its foes, these are the opened doors. Nothing can prevent our entering in except our own lack of will and effort and faith.[1]

So many things seem to close the doors of life. There is the unexpected disappointment. In his younger days, A. B. Davidson had ambitions after a certain path in life, the entrance to which lay through a severe examination. He went up for it and failed. The consequence was that, by and by, he became a Professor in Edinburgh, and a most profound and helpful influence in the lives of hundreds of his students. Davidson was turned into that path of usefulness, one cannot doubt, by God.[2]

[1] S. M. Berry, *The Crucible of Experience*, 135.
[2] A. Alexander, *The Glory in the Grey*, 185.

The doors seem to be closed. But they are not. Never believe that God shuts a door. It may even be sin which we have indulged, and yet at the end when we turn back, we find the opened door. 'When he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and ran to meet him.' It may be the awful loneliness of sorrow. But that door is opened also. 'I go to prepare a place for you.' It may be suffering and care. There is an entrance still. 'If so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together.' And for everything which conspires to make the world hard and dreary and disappointing there is this word which meets us at every turn, 'Nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' He has opened all the gates for us, and whatever way we are walking, there is an open door before us.

And then there lies the little which rests with ourselves, our own committal of self to God. Surely it is a tremendous truth that while nothing in the world or out of it can shut the doors which God has opened, yet a spirit within our own hearts, a little faithlessness, a sullen indifference, a low contentment, can keep us on the outside of those opened doors. We can separate ourselves and take a lonely path and miss the glory of earth and heaven. But thanks be to God when we do come to ourselves and take the decisive step of return, there are no refusals to bar the way. Life under God's grace is an open door, and the supreme condition of living in the only sense that counts is the opened heart.

For the Sake of the Sufferer.

By the Reverend W. Parton Shinton, Cowra, New South Wales.

Of the many miracles Jesus wrought upon the extended tour so briefly described by Mark (1[39]), 'And he went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils,' the healing of the leper is the only one narrated in detail.

Why was this miracle the best remembered, or the most significant among so many?

It contains several features which, so far as the Gospels go, had no parallel earlier in the ministry of Jesus, and so no parallel earlier in the experience of the six apostles who saw the event and kept the story.

The first special feature is that here for the first time Jesus is dealing with leprosy, that creeping disease which the Jews regarded as incurable, dreadful because inflicted directly and wrathfully by God Himself to punish outrageous moral evil. Jehoram, in a despairing rhetorical question, cried to Naaman, Am I God to recover a man from his leprosy? Lepers were rather abhorred for their

supposed sinfulness than pitied for their misfortune. It was 'the finger of God' that wasted their flesh. They had been abominably branded as abandoned sinners for all to see and take heed. 'Full of leprosy' (Lk 5^{12}), his visible parts covered with sores, here must be a chief of sinners. That a man in a condition so horrible could be met 'in one of their cities' was due to the fact that only in its earlier stages, before the disease clearly showed itself, was a leper driven from society: for a merciful provision of the law enacted that 'if the leprosy break out abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin . . . from the head even unto his feet . . . then he is clean' (Lv 13^{12-16}). That Jesus here dealt, and for the first time, with a disease regarded as a penalty for sin, and that the healing of the leper implied forgiveness of his sin, were reasons enough by themselves for this miracle to be singled out for record.

In the Gospels there are signs of what looks like progression—an advance from less to more significant, even if not from simpler to more complex cases—in the miracles up to this point and even past it, as though Jesus used His power more fully as time went on. If any distinction can or should be drawn between works which were all signs and wonders, we may say that the miracle at Cana was the simplest, not to say the least significant, and that the moral miracle of forgiveness (which Jesus had not wrought up to this time) would claim to be the most blessed to the recipient, and the most revealing of the giver. At any rate, not until after a large number of healings of afflictions with no spiritual implications, and quite a year after changing the water into wine, did Jesus avowedly forgive sin. Moreover, this cure of the leper seems to mark a middle point in our Lord's treatment of men as sinful; when Peter cried his confession after the draught of fishes, the Master's reply contains no trace of forgiveness; in the case of this leper forgiveness, though not mentioned, was clearly implied; while a short time after, when he had returned again to Capernaum, He forgives the paralytic his sin avowedly, directly, and without even being asked.

A second special mark in this miracle comes out of the leper's hypothesis, 'If thou art willing.' Sermons upon this sentence, after praising the man's faith in the power of Jesus, usually proceed to blame his unbelief in the Lord's willingness. It does seem at the first glance—especially as a commentary—that the man's faith in the power was vitiated by doubt of the willingness. But some considerations seem to show that his doubt of the willingness had some good ground, even in the actions of Jesus Himself.

His doubt might with full warrant have begun by having heard of no cure of his awful malady by Jesus; further, contact with himself would involve Jesus in ceremonial defilement; also he might expect the supposed spiritual element in his malady to deter the Master; and doubt of willingness so based is not easily to be blamed.

But there is something more, even if these were not enough. We far too readily assume our Lord's willingness to work miracles whenever asked, from the fact that not once did He finally refuse. For ourselves, we are far from being sure that He was on every occasion so delighted to perform them as we are to read about them. Why did He begin at all to work miracles? His own words at Cana answer: 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe' (Jn 4^{48}). Believe what? Not His willingness. The people around, if not the king's officer himself, took that easily for granted. Without miracles they would not believe a certain fact about Himself, the chief fact about Himself. And that fact about Himself which made miracles worth while and signs as well as wonders, was His Divine Sonship. To reveal that Sonship He began miracles; with this motive He wrought them until it was all too clear that people failed to perceive their message; and the time came when He wrought them mainly for other reasons. The above passage shows that Jesus had been disappointed by the meagre spiritual results of His miracles. After the numerous series in Jerusalem during His first Passover, Nicodemus could call Him no more than 'a teacher sent from God.' In Capernaum He openly complained of men's lack of insight; the day came when He directly turned aside the request of the Canaanite woman; while before the end, His woes upon Capernaum, because for all the miracles in her streets she had not repented, mark His final disappointment at the small results that followed His mighty works. It is true that but a few months earlier Jesus had healed many after sunset, but to Peter and others who early next morning after a wide search found Him in a place apart, He publicly declared that He would not return to Capernaum upon their request, as He intended to go into neighbouring towns, not in order to work miracles (the refusal is tacit, the distinction

pointed), but to preach. This announcement would be almost sure to spread a feeling that miracles were not His first line of action—and they never were—so that a leper free to move among men would know well from events in Capernaum that Jesus had power to heal him, and yet be likely to imbibe from the answer to the searchers a doubt of His willingness.

Of course it will be rejoined that Jesus had already upon this tour wrought many miracles, and that the leper must have heard of them, especially as they had occurred in synagogues during His preaching. But these miracles seem, one and all, to have been casting out of demons. Now it is clear that our Lord's exorcisms stood on another plane altogether from the rest of the miracles. Sufferers thus afflicted, as certainly in Capernaum (Mk $1^{23.24}$), and very probably during this circuit (Mk 1^{39}), not only interrupted His preaching in the synagogues, but interrupted it in a manner and with ascriptions very unwelcome to the Master. In Capernaum He had wrathfully commanded, 'Be muzzled,' and during the healing scene the same evening He prevented the possessed from speaking 'because they recognized him.' For whatever reasons Jesus objected to these distraught testimonies, it seems that He healed the demoniacs in these cases to protect Himself; so they do not weigh against our argument.

The third special feature was that the terrible condition of the leper appealed to an emotion first mentioned here of Jesus, an emotion felt so strongly that it overcame all other considerations and won His willingness completely. He was 'moved with compassion.' Not earlier is compassion named as motive for a miracle. Though we dare not rule out compassion from any of the miracles, compassion had never been so visible as plainly to be read for His leading motive in healing. As months went on, and men blindly, perversely, missed the evidential meaning of the miracles for His Sonship (which, we repeat, was their earliest and deepest motive), neither believing in Him as Son, nor repenting their sins; and as the woes of sufferers appealed ever more powerfully to His heart, compassion eventually became His most frequent motive for miracle. At first intended as revelations to the seeing soul, among unseeing, suffering humanity, they inevitably tended to become the immediate surgery of a heart which, 'being moved with compassion,' would not withhold its gracious relief. Mark alone mentions His compassion here. It is not impossible that the apostles beheld on this occasion a real unwillingness, on whatever ground and however displayed, in this man's own case effectually removed by His pity.

We remain reverent before the Master, seeing Him now described, for the first time, as 'moved with compassion' for suffering, and with no further motive exerting His power to heal. Whether the sympathy glowed through the clear windows of His eyes, or tears marked His cheek, it was most openly indicated in the emphatic gesture with which, stretching forth His hand, He touched the leper and healed him.

As we read the Gospel stories, this was the first miracle Jesus wrought solely and completely for the sake of the sufferer.

Contributions and Comments.

The Unnamed Companion of Cleopas.

In his most interesting contribution in your February number, Mr. Charlesworth suggests that the unnamed companion of Cleopas was his wife, whom he identifies with the Mary, wife of Clopas, of Jn 19^{25}. In a volume of sermons,[1] published in 1911, I made the same suggestion, but have not been very successful in interesting other people in it. I hope that it may now receive further consideration, and I am grateful to Mr. Charlesworth for the able case which he has made out. There are two other points which I think deserve mention. The first is that we look for a reason for this early appearance of the Risen Lord related in such detail, and we find it in the fact that Mary had stood by the Cross. Surely that constituted a claim for the comfort and joy which the Lord brought to her as to Mary Magdalene. Secondly, in those days it is most improbable that two men would have lived alone in

[1] *The Crown of Thorns* (E. Arnold).

the house at Emmaus. We hear of no one else at the evening meal. But it seems natural enough that Cleopas and his wife should invite the stranger to accept their hospitality. A. E. Burn.

The Deanery, Salisbury.

Note on the Meaning of θλίψις in the N.T.

Is not θλίψις one of those words that obtained a new connotation, a specialized meaning, as it were, to express a new fact that the Christian Gospel had brought into the experience of men—the fact, namely, that severe and protracted suffering may be accepted and endured solely for the sake of Christ and His cause?

The most usual renderings of θλίψις into English in the N.T. are 'tribulation' and 'affliction.' Now Webster defines 'tribulation' as 'severe affliction.' If we regard the 'affliction' as having the quality of being voluntarily borne, as being not necessary and inevitable, but escapable, or such as will cease if only Christ be renounced, several passages of the Scripture seem both to take on an added force and to become of more practical value for our own guidance and encouragement.

The distinction between 'affliction' in general and affliction in this narrower sense appears to be valid, but the writer has not found any hint of it in any authority he has been able to consult, and would be glad to have, by courtesy of the Editor, the opinions of readers of The Expository Times.

It is not argued that θλίψις has always this specialized meaning. There are cases, *e.g.* Ac 7^{11}, where it is obviously inadmissible. On the other hand, if this meaning be accepted, the unqualified statement of St. Paul in Ro 5^{3}, 'tribulation worketh patience,' would no longer perplex by its seeming conflict with fact. For if 'tribulation' mean no more than 'severe affliction,' then it appears to work, in some cases, anything but patience, nay, the very opposite of patience. But if 'tribulation' be that affliction which results from persecution for the sake of Christ, which could at once be got rid of by apostasy, or from privation or hardship or suffering of any kind accepted because of loyalty to the claim of the Master and borne stedfastly in dependence on His grace, then it must inevitably work 'patience.'

Similarly, to mention only two other instances, is there not a new force given to such a saying of St. Paul as that in 2 Co 4^{17}, and that of St. John in Rev 1^{9}? D. Wark.

Kimberley, South Africa.

Philippians ii. 12.

Opening, the other day, an old (1855!) volume of *The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, vol. ii. No. 4, I lighted, as by accident, on p. 92, where there is an arrestingly interesting note on this text by a contributor signing 'P.' The point that he strives to make is that, considering the position of the phrase μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου, it may quite legitimately be connected either with the words preceding or with those following. All, he thinks, is a matter of punctuation. He would connect the phrase with the words preceding—punctuating thus, ὑπηκούσατε μὴ . . . μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου,—making his English rendering something like this: So then, my beloved, even as ye have always *obeyed* (not as in my presence only, but, as things have turned out (νῦν), much more in my absence) *with awe and reverence*, work out your own salvation.

With strong plausibility the writer supports his view by reference to the two other passages in St. Paul's Epistles where the phrase μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου occurs—these cases both having direct connexion with *submission to authority*. The first passage is 2 Co 7^{15}; the second is Eph 6^{5}. 'Here,' says the writer of the Note, 'are two clear instances of the Pauline usage of this expression *denoting awe and reverence for authority*. Since, if we adopt a different punctuation, it stands in a precisely similar connexion in the present passage, why should it not here also receive the same interpretation?'

The Note, albeit written in 1855, must, I think, possess much interest for many readers of The Expository Times of 1923, and, perhaps, additional light on the subject from some reader and contributor will be forthcoming.

P. Thomson.

Dunning.

A Text (Luke xiii. 33).

What Jesus meant by this is not immediately clear. He appears to be anxious that His death

shall take place in Jerusalem; but why would it never do for a Prophet to perish outside Jerusalem? The following verse refers to Jerusalem as the City which has always slain its Prophets and stoned the messengers sent to her. It is an established custom which must not be violated; precedent points to Jerusalem as the place of prophetic martyrdoms. This is severe irony, for never before has Jesus shown Himself so careful of custom or precedent. The fact that He refused to be bound by tradition was precisely the ground of the Pharisees' hostility. Jesus is now 'twitting' the Pharisees with their love of observation of precedent, and ironically assuring them that, in regard to His death, all tradition shall be duly observed. Let us reconstruct the scene. The Pharisees come to warn Him of the intentions of Herod. We can easily believe that Herod Antipas might have evil designs, but what astonishes us is the manifestation of concern for Jesus on the part of the Pharisees. Was it genuine?

We know of the later alliance between the Pharisees and the Herodians. They were probably already acting in concert. Herod doubtless wished to be rid of Jesus for several reasons. He was certainly a man who, though he lacked the will to change his manner of life, felt uncomfortably accused in conscience by the preaching of John, and therefore we may presume by the teaching of Jesus. But Herod was also afraid. There were times when he supposed that Jesus was John the Baptist, whom he had beheaded, returned from the dead. The memory of John haunted him, so Herod was afraid to lay hands on Jesus although he would gladly see Him removed beyond his jurisdiction.

This desire to shift the responsibility for action against Jesus is manifested again at a later stage. When Pilate sent Him to Herod, Herod sent Him back to Pilate.

This timely warning was therefore most probably prearranged. If Herod would not move to arrest Jesus, the Pharisees were confident that they could get the Sanhedrim to do so. It therefore suits both Herod and the Pharisees that Jesus should be driven into Judea, and no doubt Herod gave them permission to announce to Jesus the danger in which He stood in order to hasten His departure into Judea.

The Lord's reply is most suitable to this reading of the situation. The phrase 'Go and tell that fox' has in view the cunning behind the intrigue, and the reply that follows may be paraphrased thus: 'I am not going. I bide My time. I have work to do here for a few days yet. No Herod shall prevent Me from completing My task.' The next sentences seem to be addressed specifically to the Pharisees. Let us paraphrase again. To them He says, 'Don't be disappointed, however. When the time comes I go to Jerusalem. Then you can do your worst. Your warning about Herod is too transparent. It is at your hands that I shall suffer death. It would never do for a Prophet to perish outside Jerusalem.'

F. A. Farley.

Leytonstone.

Entre Nous.

We have pleasure in announcing, as requested, that a Summer School of Theology for men and women is to be held at Oxford from August 6th to 17th. It will embrace about forty Lectures, under the general heading of 'Aspects of Contemporary Theology,' which will be treated in connexion with the Philosophy and Psychology of Religion, Biblical Study, Comparative Religion, and current movements in Sociology, Science, and Literature. The School will be opened on the evening of August 6th with an Address by the Rev. Dr. Selbie, Principal of Mansfield. The list of expected Lecturers includes the Right Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester, Professors K. Budde (Marburg), E. De Faye (Paris), A. S. Eddington, Robert H. Kennett, Jas. Moffatt, W. P. Paterson, A. S. Peake, K. H. Roessingh (Leiden), J. A. Smith, Graham Wallas, Drs. William Brown, J. E. Carpenter, H. Gow, Stanley A. Mellor, P. H. Wicksteed, Revs. F. E. Hutchinson, H. D. A. Major, Charles E. Raven, A. E. J. Rawlinson, D. C. Simpson, Father Leslie J. Walker, S.J., Mr. Alban B. Widgery, the Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

TWO TEXTS.

Lk. x. 41, 42.

'What did Jesus mean when He said, "One thing is needful"? Did He mean to say that one thing

was needful for Mary and Martha alike? Was He thinking at all of what *they* needed? That is the general interpretation, but I am persuaded that it is wrong. If you will look at the Revised Version you will find in the margin an alternative reading for this phrase; one which comes from some of the oldest manuscripts, but which the revisers, perhaps out of considerations of sentiment, did not put into the actual text. That reading runs thus: "But few things are needful, or one."

'Let us accept that version, and then see how it alters the whole sense of the passage. Jesus comes into this home at Bethany. . . . You can see the picture—the sounds of Martha hurrying to make ready, and Mary does not stir to help her! And Martha's irritation grows until in a moment when she forgets herself, she blames Jesus for her sister's idleness. "Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone?" . . . Now what does Jesus reply? He deals very tenderly with Martha, for He understands so well that all this fret and hurry is her clumsy offering to His comfort. He speaks to her without a trace of rebuke, "Martha, Martha, you are anxious and troubled about preparing many things for Me, but really there are only a few things that are needed," and then (striking a deeper note) He adds: "or one."

'Do you grasp what He means? He is not speaking of what the sisters need, but of what He needs . . . He says to Martha, "You are anxious about preparing for Me many things, but I need very little, indeed, I need one thing, and Mary has chosen to give Me that. The simplest fare is all I need for outward hospitality, there is no cause for fret or worry about getting that ready, but what I want most of all is communion of mind with mind, and Mary is giving Me that."'[1]

Jn. xx. 7.

'"And Peter beholdeth the linen cloths lying, and the napkin, that was upon his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but rolled up in a place by itself." Then Christ, too, loved order, and even in that supreme moment, when joy in His completed work of redemption must have transmuted all earthly values—even then the habits of His life persisted, and He could be at the pains of folding away the head-bandage "in a place by itself." He had achieved an act so stupendous as the salvation of a world, and yet He could concern Himself with the orderly disposal of a linen cloth. If, as we believe, it cost more to redeem the world than to create it, may we not in all humility find something akin to the redemptive wherever with the high purpose we set ourselves to bring order out of confusion—whether it be in a broken life, or a bewildered country, or a torn and stricken world?'[2]

[1] S. M. Berry, *Revealing Light*, 172.

SOME TOPICS.

Personal Revivalism.

The title of Mr. Harold Begbie's new book is *Life Changers* (Mills & Boon; 5s. net).

It is an account of the work of an Evangelist who speaks not to crowds, but to the individual. 'His genius,' Mr. Begbie says, 'lies in thinking with an intense preoccupation of individual persons. To him the man is much more than the multitude, the part infinitely greater than the whole, which is probably true in the spiritual sphere.'

The proof of conversion, the Revivalist holds, is a power of seeing men not in the mass but individually. 'He sees a significant parable in the scriptural incident of the blind man healed by the touch of Jesus. At the first touch of those gentle fingers the blind saw men walking as trees; at the second he saw "every man clearly." F. B. tells those who come to him that so long as they see men in the mass, see them as a forest, their spiritual eyes are only half opened; to see them individually, man by man, and each man a piece of divinity, an heir of eternal life, requires the second touch of the spiritual hand—the miracle of conversion.'

We are not told the name of the Revivalist. He is spoken of as F. B. because he wishes to remain anonymous. We gather that he is a mystic and that he holds a number of 'theological dogmas' which Mr. Begbie himself does not hold. But what Mr. Begbie is specially interested in is his work among undergraduates and the secret of his success. This is how his work among the undergraduates began. He was asked by two Anglican bishops in the East, who had been struck by the effect of his personal revivalism amongst missionaries, to pay a visit to their sons in Cambridge, so that they might know his ideas of religion on the threshold of their manhood. When visiting Cambridge, F. B. found 'a very distressing state of things in the colleges of

[2] Jessie F. Andrews in *The Congregational Quarterly*, vol. i. p. 161.

the University. He called a few of his followers to his side, and began a private work, to all intents and purposes a conversational work, among the undergraduates of Cambridge,' and now we are told that 'a new knowledge of religion is spreading among men who may exercise a strong influence on English-speaking civilization during the next fifty years.'

What is the secret, then, of F. B.'s success? Mr. Begbie says that the distinguishing characteristic of his work is 'the exclusive and pathological emphasis he lays on the power of sin to rob a man's soul of its natural health—sin being understood, not merely as great vices, but as any motion in the will contrary to such excellence as that soul might reach by a genuine desire for spiritual evolution.'

It is not intellectual difficulties, he holds, that keep men from God; it is sin. And when a student comes to him with his mental difficulties and with the admission that he is out of touch with God, he brushes aside all the mental excuses of the distressed man and confronts him with the fact that it is sin, a sin which he does not really wish to give up and will not give up without a great struggle, that is destroying his happiness and depriving him of power.

Wherever there is a desire for God, however small it may be, the enslaved will may be freed. And it is the work of religion to create and strengthen this desire for God so that the man finally escapes from the slavery of sin, his will works in unison with God's will, and he reaches his 'highest usefulness to the purposes of evolution in a direct and living consciousness of God.'

Life Changers should have its place on the shelf beside 'Broken Earthenware.' They are both accounts of life changers. One by the method of emotionalism, and the other by that of simple, direct, and unimpassioned conversation.

Ernst Troeltsch.

'There he shone a bright star in a bright firmament. Heidelberg at the time was the summer rendezvous of all the "cosmopolitans,"—and with good reason. Thode was in the heyday of his influence, drawing large crowds to his lectures on Art; Windelband was filling the *Auditorium* to hear his lectures on "Philosophy since Kant"; in the theological faculty H. von Schubert (Church History), Johannes Weiss, son of Bernhard Weiss (New Testament), and Troeltsch were a trio unmatched in any German university. The fame of Troeltsch can be judged from the fact that students of other faculties made a point of hearing him at least once during their course. How much they understood is another matter!

His influence on the theological students was an indication of the unusual quality of the man. A story went the rounds that in one and the same year he received and refused two invitations to Berlin, one to the Chair of Theology, the other to that of Philosophy—posts regarded as the "plums" in the German scholastic world. Be the story true or not, all who know student life will easily read its significance. He was a great man, frank, unassuming, and very human. Men talked of him in superlatives, and to get admitted to his seminar was accounted a real honour even by the German "theologs" themselves.

His method of lecturing had something to do with it. He came into the room like a gust of wind, banging the door behind him, began talking immediately with a strong flow of eloquence, and, almost before the poor *Ausländer* could adjust himself to the fact that the lecture had started, the class was vociferous in its laughter. Passages of importance he slowly dictated, and then followed further eloquence, lighted up with the inevitable wit. As a lecturer he was a success, quite apart from the fact that he had a point of view which men felt to be valuable and worth much effort to secure. He was far removed from the type of professor pictured in the popular imagination—dry as dust, solemn to boredom, and poles distant from life. Long after his students were out in their respective spheres he kept in touch with them, finding time for a voluminous correspondence, while many came to ask his advice on practical issues. His interest in social matters was of great help to many of the younger ministers of the German Church, and, along with others, he did much to inaugurate a new tradition for the ministry—a tradition approaching our own in its ideals of freedom and humanitarianism. The formalism of the German Church was quite alien to his mind.'[1]

The Influence of Personality.

'A woman sought out Drummond late one Saturday evening and asked him to come to the house. She said: "My husband is deein', sir: he's no able to speak to you, and he's no able to hear you, but I would like him to hae a breath o' you aboot him afore he dies."'[2]

[1] Arthur Dakin, in *The Congregational Quarterly*, vol. i. p. 144.

[2] A. H. Walker, *Radiant Christianity: Life-Story of Henry Drummond*, 19.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THREE complete series, with five volumes in each, have now been published under the general title of 'The Scholar as Preacher.' The fourth series begins with a volume by Dr. C. F. Burney, and now the second volume in this series has just been issued. It is *The Adventure into the Unknown*, by the Venerable R. H. CHARLES, D.Litt., D.D. The title is taken from the first sermon. The volume contains twenty sermons, all of which were preached in Westminster Abbey.

It is difficult when all are so good to choose one Sermon for special notice. We were tempted to deal with the last one, where Dr. CHARLES discusses Neutrality and its impossibility in the moral and spiritual worlds. But instead we choose his treatment of humility and meekness in the third sermon.

The subject of this sermon is the two beatitudes which are found in the 3rd and 5th verses of the 5th chapter of St. Matthew. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.' Dr. CHARLES begins by a consideration of the number of the beatitudes. He argues that it would be more natural to expect seven than eight, seven being a sacred number, and sacred numbers playing an important part in St. Matthew. And he gives a number of analogies. 'Thus in chapter xxiii. there are seven woes pronounced against the religious leaders of Judaism—a fact that might suggest that there were seven beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. St. Matthew also groups together seven parables in chapter xiii. and seven petitions in the Lord's Prayer, whereas in St. Luke ix. 2–4 there are only five petitions. Again, in chapter i., St. Matthew deliberately omits several names in the genealogy of Christ in order to compress it into three groups each of fourteen names, *i.e.* six groups of seven.'

Having led us from these analogies to expect seven and not eight beatitudes, Dr. CHARLES turns our attention to the MSS. and to the fact that there is a conflicting order in verses 4 and 5, which may well point to some interpolation. 'Whereas,' he says, 'most MSS. and Versions uphold the present order of verses 4 and 5, one great uncial and the two oldest Versions reverse the order and put verse 5 before verse 4.'

Wellhausen and Professor Bacon of Yale hold that verse 5, 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth,' is the interpolation. They believe that this verse was first written as a gloss in the margin and then subsequently incorporated in the text by most authorities after verse 4, and by a powerful minority after verse 3.

Dr. CHARLES holds, on the other hand, that it

is verse 4, 'Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted,' which has been interpolated, and he gives two reasons.

'First of all,' he says, 'verse 4 comes in most awkwardly between 3 and 5, which are essentially related to each other, seeing that verse 5 presupposes verse 3. That is, the meekness that is commended in verse 5 presupposes the humility that is commended in verse 3. Hence we should expect verse 5 to follow immediately on verse 3. In confirmation of this close connexion between verses 5 and 3, we might quote Matt. xi. 29, where the two ideas are brought together in the same sentence: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and humble in heart." Nowhere else in the other three Gospels does this combination of these two graces occur.' To the objection that the words are found in St. Luke, according to the Prayer Book version of the *Magnificat*—'He hath exalted the humble and meek,' he replies that this is a corrupt reading which established itself in the Prayer-Book in the sixteenth century. The true reading is simply 'the humble.' 'Thus,' he says, 'the combination "humble and meek" belongs only to the first Gospel. Hence to read verse 5 immediately after verse 3 would be thoroughly characteristic of St. Matthew, and if any verse is to be rejected it is not verse 5 but verse 4, since it severs two ideas which are essentially allied.'

But Dr. CHARLES has a second reason. 'Even,' he says, 'if we follow the less strongly attested text and read verse 4 after verse 5, this will not be sufficient. For verse 4, "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted," is different in form from the rest of the beatitudes in Matthew. In Matthew each class that is blessed is carefully defined, so that it is at once recognized as worthy to be blessed—the poor in spirit, the meek, those that hunger and thirst after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, those that are persecuted for righteousness' sake. But there is no such clearness in the words, "Blessed are they that mourn." The class of mourners here would, if this beatitude came from St. Matthew's hand, have been as carefully defined as are the other classes in the rest of the beatitudes. For these mourners do not include individuals or nations mourning over the wreck of their baffled knaveries, or the miscarriage of their treacherous deceits.'

If, then, we accept seven as the number of the beatitudes and hold that verse 4 is the intrusion, verses 3 and 5 come together. And this juxtaposition Dr. CHARLES finds very illuminating. We have here two classes, both of whom are blessed, 'the humble', for that is the meaning of 'the poor in spirit', and 'the meek'—'the humble', who already possess the Kingdom of Heaven, and 'the meek', who do not yet possess the earth, but who at some future time shall possess it.

Dr. CHARLES then goes on to discuss the nature of humility and the nature of meekness. 'Humility,' he says, 'does not consist in the mere absence of pretension, certainly not in a morbid self-deprecating spirit, it is no transient state of feeling into which a man may artificially work himself; rather it is a true and right estimate of ourselves, made in all soundness of mind, an estimate which Christian ethics does not require us to falsify or unjustly lower. St. Paul bids us not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, but to have a right and sound judgment of ourselves.' And as the standard of Christianity is immeasurably high, being divine, every stage of fulfilment is at the best imperfect, and so from the contrast between what the Christian has done and what he ought to have done arises the Christian grace of humility. The Christian man cannot but think lowly of himself if he would think truly; for he knows that his real worth in the world is that which he stands for—not in men's sight, but in God's. If this is the nature of humility we can understand the promise given by Christ, that the humble in spirit are even now citizens of His Kingdom.

What, then, is the relationship of the second

beatitude, 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth,' to the first beatitude? Dr. CHARLES answers that meekness is in a sense a complement of humility, for Christian meekness is 'the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace of humility.' But meekness is more than this, for Dr. CHARLES says 'it is humility itself coming into manifestation in the sphere of human life.'

And so we see that if this is the inner spring of meekness, it can have nothing in common with weak-kneed irresolution or with any meanness of spirit. The aim of the meek man, however faulty he may be in the fulfilment of it, 'is to do God's will and not to achieve his own individual rights or vindicate his own individual claims or dignities.' Meekness requires courage, singleness of aim, self-control, self-sacrifice. And to the men who have these 'the promise of Christ naturally is: "The meek"—that is, the willing servants of God's will—"shall inherit the earth." It is not to the arrogant, the high-handed, the rapacious: it is not to the so-called super-men in this or other lands, that the earth and all that is therein shall ultimately belong, but to the humble and the meek: to those who, having sought first and above all the kingdom of God and His righteousness, find that to this eternal heritage there is added another they did not seek—even the heritage of this world and all that is best therein.'

The Bible is full of unfinished stories, both small and great. On the great scale we have the Book of Acts. The writer describes his 'former treatise' as the story of 'all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach.' In the Acts that story is continued, but not finished. It is not finished yet. What Jesus began by Himself is continued in the Acts through Peter and Paul and others, who 'both did and taught' in His spirit. The story is continued through all the history of the Church through successive centuries from that day to this, and it will be continued in all the words and works of His sincere representatives, the conspicuous and the inconspicuous alike, to the end of time. The Book of Acts is the greatest unfinished story of all.

But there are also short unfinished stories, some of them very short, but full of poignant meaning and challenging suggestiveness. There is the story of the Prodigal Wife of the Old Testament. Every one knows the tale of Hosea's unutterable love for his erring wife. Perhaps she had been one of the women attached to a shrine, as women may be in India to-day, and dedicated to the immoral worship so prevalent in those riotous days. In any case she was unfaithful as a wife to the man who loved her utterly, and who came to see in his own inextinguishable love for her an adumbration of the infinitely greater love of God for Israel.

He did all he could to win her back again. He bought her back for half the price of a slave and kept her under gentle restraint, in the hope that she might learn the meaning of her own grievous sin and of his mighty love. Did she respond? We do not know. 'It may be,' says Dr. T. W. CRAFER, in his recent *Commentary on Hosea* (reviewed in 'Literature'), 'that this tragedy of home had no happy ending. Or the husband's unending hope may at length have had its reward, and, accepting the two last children as his own, he took the prefix from their names and called them Ruhamah, "pitied," and Ammi, "my people." And yet, had this been the case, he would surely have tried to forget the sorrows of the past and keep them locked in his own breast. But, as he utters his message, we find him still in bitter anguish of soul.' Sad indeed it would be if such surpassing love remained unrequited to the end. It seems only too possible. But we do not know.

Then there is the unfinished story of the Prodigal Son of the Old Testament. Who is he? Unquestionably Jonah. He, too, had had experience of a love mighty to save, and he was sent by the Good Father of us all to proclaim that love to an enemy alien people. He went, but he went with

hate in his heart, a hatred heightened by the ready repentance of those to whom he proclaimed his message. What a fearful picture that of the sullen prophet, sitting comfortably in the shade of his booth 'till he might see what would become of the city.'

He kept his lonely watch in faith and hope: for perhaps the righteous God would destroy the once wicked city after all. Then come the two immortal verses which close the book, in which God, speaking to him as a man might to his friend, and appealing tenderly to the glimmer of affection for the gourd in Jonah's wicked and angry heart, sought to wake in him the feeling that Nineveh, too, lay within the Divine love and care. Were there not thousands of little folk in Nineveh who did not know their right hand from their left, and much cattle?

Was this tender appeal made in vain? We do not know. There is no record of any response. The book ends on this magnificent note, and with this soul-stirring vision of the all-comprehensive love of God. But was Jonah's soul stirred? Apparently not. At any rate the last we see of him is with a scowl upon his face, the last we hear from him is that he 'does well to be angry' at the love of God.

And then there is the Elder Brother of the New Testament in the story familiar as The Prodigal Son, but more happily entitled The Loving Father. He, too, was angry at his father's love, angry at the music and the dancing and the feasting with which the father welcomed home his penitent son. His father came out and entreated him, but he would not go in. Had he not slaved all his life, and all for nothing? In his father's house it seemed that piety was to be ignored and profligacy rewarded.

This story, like the last, closes on infinitely gracious words from the lips of the father. He loved both his sons. 'Son, thou art ever with me.' Does the elder son care nothing for that? for uninterrupted fellowship with his loving father? Does he care nothing that his young brother has come back from the dead? for it was death to be living as he had lived in the far country. Gently, but firmly, the father defends himself for the joy with which he had welcomed back his wandering son. 'It was meet to make merry and be glad.' Was the elder brother won by this gracious appeal? We do not know. The last time we see him, he is standing outside, angry, and refusing to go in. The last words we hear from him are words of coarse indignation against the son whom he refuses to acknowledge as brother, and words of reproach against the father for his absurd love of so unworthy a son. Who is the Prodigal Son now?

These three unfinished stories have this in common, that they deal with the rejection of an exquisite love. Gomer the daughter of Diblaim, Jonah the son of Amittai, the Elder Brother—they are all alike in having been brought face to face with a Love which longed to win them and make them its own for ever; and, so far as we know, they refused to be won. That is the tragedy of tragedies—to be brought face to face with some one who is 'most wonderfully kind,' and to refuse to respond. Why should human lives deliberately elect the outer darkness? Why should such stories not end with the penitent and rapturous acceptance of so wonderful a love? The silence of the Bible shows that it knows well how hard the human heart can be.

The Church Quarterly Review for April contains an interesting article on 'The Present Value of the Earliest Christian Apologetic,' by the Rev. W. Maurice Pryke. It is only at the very end of the article that the 'value' of this early defence of Christian belief is touched on. The substance of the article deals with the nature and justification of the apologetic.

The second Christian century is generally distinguished as the Age of Apologists. But in point of fact the missionary preaching of the primitive Christian community was characterized by a pro-

nounced apologetic tendency, and for a good reason. The cardinal point of dispute between Jew and Christian from the first was the Messiahship of Jesus. The idea of a *Christus Crucifixus* was to the Jew a glaring paradox. Yet the disciples accepted it. They had believed in the Messiahship of Jesus in His lifetime, probably before the last visit to Jerusalem. This is an important point, as will be seen in a moment.

The Cross was a blow to the disciples in spite of the Master's repeated hints, which, perhaps, were couched in less definite terms than the Gospels would lead us to suppose. What was it, then, that changed the despair of Good Friday into the triumphant conviction of Pentecost? 'The Resurrection appearances,' is the usual answer. But these provide only a partial answer. Their faith was grounded equally on their experience of the earthly life. This, however, is not the present point. The point is that neither of these reasons could convince the sceptical Jew or the ignorant Gentile. What *would* convince them?

Now the strongest objection of the Jew to the Christian position was its lack of support in the nation's Scriptures. And with remarkable intuition the early believers saw that this was the crux of the whole matter. It was vitally necessary to discover in Scripture, predictions of a Suffering Messiah fulfilled in Jesus. The Cross was to them part of the Divine plan and must have been foreshadowed in the prophets. This, therefore, was the line taken by the earliest apologists for Christianity. The Old Testament became the battleground of Jews and Christians, with the result that all primitive Christian theology is Jewish in method. The elaboration of the proof from prophecy formed in fact the real theological work of Christians in early days.

A detailed study of the speeches in the Book of Acts gives us a vivid insight into the methods of the early Christian apologist. Peter, Stephen, Philip, Paul, James, and Apollos all ground their argument on the predictions of the Old Testament. The appeal of one and all is the proof from Scripture, which foretold a Suffering Messiah and no less clearly His resurrection, ascension, and return to glory. Acts not only furnishes us with the passages referred to, but repeatedly affirms that this was the method employed by all the missionaries.

This apologetic was not only convincing to Jews. It carried equal weight with Gentiles, proselytes, and pagans. The appeal of the Apostles to their own experience of Jesus was limited in its power. But this argument was overwhelming to those who believed in sacred and inspired Scriptures. No Jew could refuse a hearing to statements which, however improbable in themselves, were backed by such an august authority.

What value has this apologetic for us? We can no longer use the Scriptures as the early Christians did. A truer conception of the meaning of inspiration, more accurate knowledge of the authorship, composition, and character of psalms and prophets, a fuller recognition of the human element in the Divine library, a juster appreciation of the relation of a prophet's utterances to the circumstances of his own age, have destroyed for ever the cogency of the argument from prophecy as employed formerly.

'Let us then admit unreservedly that no single passage of the Old Testament, whether from prophet or psalmist, can rightly be produced as a prediction, conscious or unconscious, of the sufferings, death, resurrection, exaltation, or return to judgement of the Messiah.' Still, this early apologetic *has* one element of supreme value for us. Its value lies in its failure. The very artificiality of the Apostles' exegesis proves that their conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus was based on other and surer grounds than their Scripture proof. It rested on the firm foundation of His own transcendent personality. It was this that created the joyous faith of the early disciples.

For them facts created predictions and not

predictions facts. And this outstanding reality of the early Christian history is a confirmation of the narrative in the Gospels. It also lends strong support to the general statement of the Gospels, that the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus is to be traced to Jesus' belief in Himself. For the disciples could not have maintained their faith if they had not known it had the support of the Master.

The Rev. Walter Lock, D.D., preached 'before' the University of Oxford in February. It was a remarkable sermon on a remarkable text. The text was: 'But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus' (Eph 4^{20-21}).

Here we have laid down two subjects of study; two and not one only, though one is the presupposition and test of the other. And they are not alternatives; they must both be taken together. The one is the learning of the Christ, the other that of truth as it is in Jesus: the message of the Christ as based upon the historic life of Jesus.

This conjunction of the two may seem to be opposed to the conviction of Paul, who (we are told) cared little for the historic life. To him the Risen Christ was all in all. But this is a mistake. It arises from a misinterpretation of a well-known saying: 'Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more.' Here what Paul speaks of is not 'Jesus,' not even 'the Christ' but 'a Christ,' and the reference is probably to those Christians who had looked for a Christ who not only would be of Jewish descent, but would make the Jews the ruling power in His kingdom. It might include Peter, and all the Apostles before Pentecost.

Think also how careful Paul is to quote definite commands of the Lord, as about divorce or the maintenance of those who preach the Gospel—'not I, but the Lord'; think what is implied of knowledge of the earthly life in the appeal to 'the meekness and large-heartedness' of the Christ as the example which he wished to imitate; or, if we may give more free play to our imagination, picture to yourself what fifteen days spent on a stay in Jerusalem, whose one object was to visit Peter, would imply; or talks with John Mark of what had happened at his mother's house in Jerusalem; or the stories Luke had collected and would impart to Paul. It is evident Paul must have known intimately the facts about Jesus.

This, then, is the first subject of study: the historic life of Jesus of Nazareth. In spite of difficulties of various kinds we know its essential features. It is recalled to us, by way both of likeness and contrast, by Gandhi's work in India. By way of likeness, in the movements from village to village, the preaching of brotherhood and sacrifice, the retirements for prayer, the eager crowds, the devoted followers. By way of contrast, in the resistance of Jesus to the terrible temptation, to which Gandhi succumbed, to turn all this to political and national ends.

We know this life then, a life of belief in God as the Father, of belief in man as the Father's child, of devotion to a great mission. And the truths we see embodied in that life must always be the guide and test of learning the Christ. For the learning of the Christ is the learning of the extension of the work of Jesus of Nazareth in His Church, of the Head in the Body, of the Inspirer in those who caught His Spirit.

We can see three stages in the learning of this lesson. The first was to pass from personal and racial divisions and hatreds to a life which should reflect the kindness of God our Saviour and His love towards man. Paul had himself undergone this change. The second was an enlarged understanding of the scope of the Gospel. First the Samaritans, then the Ethiopian eunuch, then the Roman centurion—these are examples of the way the Church learned that all who were drawn to Jesus were to be welcomed.

The third was an even more difficult lesson, the right attitude to truth itself. What was to be said of the religions around the early disciples? This, at any rate—that God had not left Himself anywhere without a witness, that the task of the Church was to announce what others worshipped in ignorance. They found Roman citizens looking to their emperor as God and Saviour, and they pointed them to the God and Saviour of all men. They saw many finding brotherhood and the hope of immortality in some mystery religion, and they pointed to the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and to the assurance of eternal life in the Risen Christ. They saw the nobler souls drawn to the Stoic teaching of dignity and self-mastery, and they pressed on them the deeper ethic of the Christian faith, hope and love.

All this was a part of the truth as it is in Jesus. But that word 'truth' has probably a deeper meaning. It suggests our word 'reality.' And this also we find in Jesus. What is Reality? A thing is real when it goes right home to the centre of our personality and proves itself true for us. Some incident of real love or sorrow lightens up words for us and shows them to us as God's words. That is what men felt about the words and actions of Jesus. They felt what a missionary in Central Africa says in a recent letter that he felt about the mountains there—that 'the Infinitely High seems the Infinitely Nigh.'

We see the sense of this developing in the Gospels. In St. Mark's Gospel the stress is laid on the Infinitely Nigh, God coming near to us in these deeds of love. St. Matthew and St. Luke both add a new thought to this. St. Matthew traces the truth which has become so nigh back along the line of Jewish history till it reaches infinitely far into the past. St. Luke's eye is turned mainly to the future, in which the Infinitely High will reach out to all mankind and satisfy its needs. An even greater step is taken by St. John. He has the thoughts of the other three, all of them, about the Christ. But there is a deeper realization of the Infinitely High. In the doctrine of the Logos, in the reach of the picture of the Sonship, we see again that the supreme Reality has become embodied in the earthly life. This is part of the 'truth as it is in Jesus.'

The subject of the Fall of man has been well to the front in recent theological thought, and there is increasing evidence that it has begun to emerge from the long eclipse into which it was cast by the doctrine of evolution. The theory of an unbroken upward progress is felt to be inadequate to cover all the facts, and the optimism based on that theory has, especially since the war, been rudely shaken. A sense has grown upon us of a profound wrongness in things, and the time seems opportune for a re-statement of the Christian doctrine of the Fall.

An able attempt at such re-statement has been made by Mr. C. W. Formby, M.A., in *The Unveiling of the Fall* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). This book is written with considerable force, and, though somewhat marred by the over-confidence of the writer, it is a thought-provoking work which will repay the reader.

Accepting without reserve the scientific theory of organic evolution, the writer claims that its testimony throws a flood of new light upon the doctrine of the Fall.

This doctrine of the Fall, however, is a very different matter from the generally accepted evolutionary theory of the Fall, according to which 'the Fall represents the moral and spiritual breakdown of the will which happened to our original two human progenitors when their unfolding powers of moral sense were first called upon for a definite choice between right and wrong.' This theory is subjected to a detailed and acute criticism. It fails to explain 'the fallenness of man's original animalism and degradation,' it reflects on 'the justice and moral responsibility of God for the critical severity of the alleged test of immature man,' it offers no

rational explanation of the pre-human stage of evolution, especially in its pain and suffering. Here are criticisms which must be reckoned with.

When the writer comes to constructive work he is less convincing. He holds the theory of a pre-organic Fall, that is, a Fall in a spiritual realm which carried as its dire consequence the entrance of the life principle into the bonds of the flesh and the whole groaning and travailing together of creation until now.

Support for this theory is sought from the history of organic evolution, and also from certain statements of St. Paul as to the cosmical significance of Christ. In this high region the argument is naturally difficult to follow, and the writer seems to waver in his conceptions of the pre-mundane Adam. He rejects Origen's doctrine (following Plato) of a 'pre-mundane fall of single souls who carry into a penal corporeal life the effect of their pre-natal sin.' Yet he speaks of 'the unfallen being or beings whose vital units we now know in their highest expression as mankind.' Later he conceives of them as having had a corporate unity which was shattered by their Fall, and is destined to be restored in Christ.

The writer confidently believes that this presentation of the Fall will most powerfully convince the world of sin. It does indeed represent sin as a terrific cosmic force, but it is not easy to see how it can create a sense of personal guilt. We may conceivably have incurred responsibility for an Adam from whom we are descended by ordinary generation, but this pre-mundane Adam is not our kith and kin. As for the origin of evil, the insoluble mystery is still there, no matter how far back it be thrown.

The Servant of the Lord.

By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D., Cambridge.

I have not seen the works of Mowinckel and Gunkel to which Professor McFadyen draws attention in The Expository Times (p. 294), but as my own view of the Servant approximates theirs, it may contribute to the much-needed reconsideration of the problem if I outline some of the points which have influenced me.[1]

Admittedly Is 40–66 belongs to a period of anticipation and reconstruction, of expectation and new birth: the period which after far-reaching disturbances led to the inauguration of Post-Exilic Judaism. Between this period and that of the rise of Christianity there is a real psychological relationship; and the present age, whose issue is so obscure to us, is akin to both. Similar experiences and similar ages supplement and interpret each other, and there is much in the Bible which the intense years in which we now live should enable us to understand, perhaps more clearly than our forefathers could. Of this the problem of the Servant is the most striking example.

Admittedly Deutero-Isaiah represents the high-water mark of Israel's spiritual religion. It was only passed some centuries later, when Judaism, instead of undergoing another rebirth or reconstruction, was unable to take a further step; and, instead of a new stage in the history and religion of a people, we have a new stage in man's religion and history. Whether our own period will witness a new stage in an old development, or the beginning of some entirely new development, future generations will be able to determine; but, in any event, we ourselves are well able to realize that to bring about any new decisive change in social-religious conditions more is needed than the possession of inspiring literature. In the lives of peoples, churches, and individuals, it is some tremendous spiritual experience that inaugurates a new stage, and sets in motion a fresh development; and when we seek to explain Israel's regeneration after the Exile, we are impelled to look for a spiritual revival,

[1] In one form or another they were set before the Society for Old Testament Study (July 21, 1921) and the Cambridge Theological Society (Oct. 27, 1921).

a distinctive religious personality, an outstanding spiritual genius.

As we peruse Is 40–66, we become conscious that the high hopes of the opening chapters are not realized; the new age is proving somewhat of a disappointment. 'We have passed from the brighter world of noble ideals and happy anticipation to the darker region of disillusionment' (Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, ii. p. 233). That there should be subsequent reaction, retrogression, or disappointment is in harmony with the fate of many a great reforming movement—one need refer only to the times of Ikhnaton (Amenhotep IV.) of Egypt and the Judæan king Josiah. But the supreme fact is that a new stage has been inaugurated, something has intervened; and Is 53 furnishes the clue. The Servant has come and gone; he was misunderstood, unrecognized, and despised. Men had awaited some one triumphant, but just as the Day of the Lord, so Amos declared, would not be in accordance with popular ideas, so the eagerly looked-for Servant of the Lord did not answer current anticipations.

Yet, as we ponder over that chapter, we realize that a new spiritual factor has been introduced. '*His* chastisement brought *our* welfare, and *our* healing came through *his* stripes.' We have only to turn back and read Professor McFadyen's translation of the *Penitential Confession* (p. 296) to perceive that the burden of the past has been removed, a new era lies open. How readily we of to-day can appreciate the situation! The past behind our back, the dawn of a new future; all our mistakes left behind us, and before us the new social age of our aspirations!

Accordingly, Is 53 is a psychological turning-point in the history of Israel. We have always needed a conception of the Servant that would allow us to understand the interpretation of that chapter. Certainly, different ideas of the Servant prevailed in the age of Deutero-Isaiah—even in the Servant-passages themselves; but if we may recognize behind chap. 53 a figure, the 'forerunner of Jesus'—to quote Gunkel's title,—the persistent Messianic interpretation finds a new justification. The age that was surpassed at the birth of Christianity produced a figure that was surpassed in the Founder of Christianity. It was a remarkable age. A Babylonian monarch set himself on an equality with the Most High (Is 14). The story of Nebuchadrezzar and Ezekiel's denunciation of the king of Tyre (ch. 28) also point in the same direction. The day of prophets and Messiahs is also a day of false prophets and pseudo-Messiahs; and when ideas of God's Immanence are at their height, it is perilously easy to ignore God's Transcendence, and exalt the human above the divine.

A new consciousness, a new daring, can be recognized at this period, and it was a period of widespread religious ferment from Greece to China. We are not to be surprised, therefore, if the age of the Servant of the Lord was one of men of tremendous personality, varying in their worth, and as differently estimated by their contemporaries as the outstanding figures of intense reforming and revolutionary energy of our own age, whom even to name would land us in endless controversy. It is enough if behind Is 53 we may perceive a religious genius, a wonderful figure in a wonderful age, and as unknown as, *e.g.*, he who, amid wholly unknown conditions, gave birth to the lofty conception of the ethical god Varuna, who stands at the head of the entire historical development of Indian religion. That he should be unknown is no more surprising than the failure of Jewish history to name even the author (or authors) of Is 40–66, or to bridge the gulf between Zerubbabel and the Judaism of Ezra and Nehemiah. And, just as Ikhnaton's religious reform, in spite of every indication of failure, left its mark upon the old Egyptian religion, so we may believe that the very presence of Is 53 is due to men who saw in the despised Servant what others failed to see, and through him gained a new inspiration and a new vision. For a spiritual genius can be recognized only by men who possess some measure of his own spirituality.

There is an increasing readiness to recognize among ancient and even among lowly religions a spiritual and 'transcendent' element, which could be *relatively* as profound as that in higher religions. Sacrificial and other rites could evoke new ideas of the supernatural; outstanding 'sacred' men, and notably priestly rulers, could reshape men's conceptions of the relation between gods and men. Such men could be intermediaries: human representatives of the god, and representatives (in another sense) of their land and people, combining at once national, collective, and personal functions. There is a steady line of thought from the old sacred king to the Messiah, the Son of David, and the mysterious figure behind Is 53 occupies a logical position in the development of ancient thought.

In conclusion, the Old Testament may be said to turn upon the rebirth of Israel—upon the spirit which inaugurated the new historical development that goes down through the Persian and Greek ages to the Christian era. Isaiah 53 is therefore of fundamental importance for the religious interpretation of history and for the history of religion. It becomes ever more obvious that the vital questions of Christianity cannot be handled apart from the Old Testament, and that a reconsideration of the problem of the Servant of the Lord will contribute to contemporary Christological discussion. After all, the Bible as a whole has arisen out of the inner history of Palestine during a relatively small number of centuries, and these centuries are so organically interconnected, as regards the development of thought, that it would be contrary to all canons of research to draw an arbitrary line, as though the Old Testament and the New could be properly understood apart from each other.

Literature.

PAPINI'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

To write a new life of Christ is not too bold an enterprise in present conditions. We have had a great deal of preliminary work in the past generation, a great many books *pour servir*. We know more of the background, of the conditions of the time, of the language and everything else. And we are ready for a fresh treatment of the Supreme Story. *The Story of Christ*, by Giovanni Papini, translated by Mary P. Agnetti (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), will not be accepted as the one we are looking for. Its main fault is one the present generation cannot overlook. But it is a really great book all the same, and one that no expositor of the Gospels can afford to neglect. It will be a gold mine to the preacher, for it is 'crawling' with sermons. And it will always have a place of its own, just because the writer is a man of genius and has looked at Jesus and read the Bible with his own eyes.

There is nothing ordinary about this book. Its merits (which are many) are extraordinary. Its main defect is quite extraordinary. As to its merits, probably the chief and the most valuable is the amazing imaginative power with which scenes are reconstructed. The scene in the Synagogue at Capernaum when Jesus preached there, with the members of the congregation described and the reasons for their presence; the story of the Prodigal Son (to which twelve pages are given), which reads as if it happened yesterday; the analysis of the way in which the Penitent Thief came to believe in Jesus—these are only a few out of many incidents which the reader feels to be *real*. This is how they must have happened. Of course it is imagination, but it is imagination fed by study and based on actualities. And it makes the reading of these pages a continual pleasure. It makes you feel you are hearing the story of Jesus for the first time.

Not only so. What strikes one about this writer is that he has pierced to the heart of things, and thinks so independently that his representations are often strikingly original. His treatment of the Sinlessness of Jesus, *e.g.*, is quite his own and extraordinarily convincing. His picture of the three teachers of Jesus is very beautiful. But even more impressive is the exposition of the teaching of Jesus. There are fifty-three pages given to the Sermon on the Mount. It is not a conventional commentary, but no one will read it without feeling he has gained a fresh insight into the mind of Jesus, and more reason to love the Bible.

It would be difficult to praise these great qualities too highly. But there is a deduction. The writer is quite uncritical. His critical attitude is mediæval. Perhaps his history accounts for this. He passed from negation to a devout Romanism, and this is his standpoint in the book. The result is frequently such that one hesitates between distress and amusement. It makes his comments sometimes quaint and on occasion grotesque. A quaint example is his explanation of Jesus' baptism: 'Jesus was about to enter on a new period of His life, on His true life. By His immersion He attested His willingness to die, and at the same time the certainty of His resurrection.' That is a fair specimen of the writer's standpoint. But it is not a great defect, after all. Papini sets out to tell the greatest story in the world and he tells it greatly, in a fashion that will make it live for multitudes. We wish he

had a better critical understanding, but that is a very little matter in comparison with the great service he has rendered to the knowledge of Jesus.

The translation is so good that the book reads like an original.

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ISRAEL.

What was the achievement of Israel? In a well-written and profoundly suggestive book, *The Achievement of Israel*: A Study in Revelation Applied to Life (James Clarke; 6s. net), the Rev. David Houston, M.A., defines it as her 'experiment in life and government inspired by religion.' No other nation ever made that experiment so thoroughly, and there is no experiment that the world more needs to make to-day. Here, as in all the difficult art of life, Israel is our teacher, and Mr. Houston skilfully marshals for us the lessons of her history by passing before us in intimate review the personalities and messages of her great prophets, from Abraham to Isaiah II. He has a real feeling for both historical and spiritual values, and his pages, though they cover familiar ground, bristle with subtle and illuminating things. Everywhere we are made to feel what a gain it was to the higher life of the world to have the prophetic criticism unceasingly directed upon the secular policy of the nation's rulers, and the analysis of Samuel and Elijah is particularly searching. The book, which is written with philosophic power and literary grace, is a really penetrating study of the inner meaning and the permanent value of Israel's history. It helps us to feel afresh the undying quality of the Old Testament, and in these days of confusion and collapse it is fitted to act as a tonic upon our bewildered hearts. 'Certain it is,' says Mr. Houston, 'that men in the thick of the fight for right and justice have rarely the feeling that God is to be defeated, even though for the moment they may be thrown back.' This book throws us back upon God and upon the great Hebrew interpreters of His ways.

It is a pleasure to note that it is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Hastings.

LANDMARKS IN FRENCH LITERATURE.

If any one wants to see how literary studies should be written, let him make haste to secure *Landmarks in French Literature*, by Mr. Lytton Strachey (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). In some respects this is the most satisfying book he has yet given us. Here are the old brilliance and sparkle, the now familiar enviable gift of style, the same fascination of an interesting mind unbosoming itself with frankness that gave Mr. Strachey his immediate success. But the tang of saltness surely a shade too salt, the sarcasm that bit sometimes a trifle viciously, that chemical turn of mind that found an odd delight in coldly resolving things that looked very fair into their actual components and inviting us to note that some of them were none too pleasant and indeed really smelly, which irritated in the 'Eminent Victorians,' and lingered on, more delicate and subtle, much less obvious, yet still cruelly there, in 'Queen Victoria'—these things are gone (or do they flicker up one moment in the severe handling of Balzac?) and are replaced by something even cleverer and much more difficult—a sympathetic effort to look out through the eyes of these French writers one by one, to think oneself into their world, to understand not only what they were, but why they were just that. He never really knew the Eminent Victorians, because he disliked them; and without sympathy real understanding is impossible. Annoyed by a chorus of praise that seemed to him insensate, he rushed in as a devil's advocate and landed himself in a like exaggeration on the other side. But here he is among his friends; for from Villon to Pascal no one is alien to him. Mr. Strachey is indeed a devoted lover of French literature. He knows its every mood and adores them all. Those quick eyes of his are not blind to its faults, and his mind admits that they are faults, but his heart is quite satisfied that it should be just what it is. And what a vivid pen he has! To read his description of Froissart is like going into battle; how unforgettable is his picture of the days of Louis XIV.; how sane his defence of Racine against our British prejudices; how sure his tread amid the intricacies of the mind of a Voltaire or a Molière or a Rousseau—and always he leans to the charitable judgment now. And how much he can put into a phrase! Froissart is 'history seen through the eyes of a herald' (p. 16). Of Montaigne—'his book flows on like a prattling brook, winding through pleasant meadows' (p. 32). 'The importance of simplicity. This was Pascal's great discovery' (p. 49). 'In the Middle Ages La Fontaine would have been . . . a monk, surreptitiously illuminating the margins of his manuscripts with the images of birds and

beasts' (p. 99). 'Bossuet was too completely a man of his own epoch to speak with any great significance to after generations' (p. 107). 'La Rochefoucauld was an aristocrat . . . he has managed . . . to preserve all through it an air of slight disdain' (p. 111). Of La Bruyère, 'one feels as one reads that this is an impartial judge' (p. 116). Of Saint Simon's portraits, 'he never forgot, in the extremity of his ferocity, to commit the last insult, and to breathe into their nostrils the fatal breath of life' (p. 137). Of Voltaire's style, 'the pointed, cutting, mocking sentences laugh and dance through his pages like light-toed, prick-eared elves. Once seen, and there is no help for it—one must follow' (p. 157). 'It is a safe rule to make, that Voltaire's meaning is deep in proportion to the lightness of his writing' (p. 164). 'Voltaire's style is narrow; it is like a rapier—all point' (p. 165). And so on indefinitely.

This book comes as a relief. 'Books and Characters' gave the somewhat melancholy impression of drawers being ransacked for old and immature manuscripts. It now seems rather to have been a moulting season, from which Mr. Strachey has emerged more vivid than before, bereft of his sting, but even more dazzlingly coloured.

PROPHECY.

In *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* (Duckworth; 5s. net), Professor T. H. Robinson tells in a most vivid and effective way the fascinating story of the rise, progress, and decline of Hebrew prophecy. Except the story of Jesus Himself, perhaps no story is better worth telling. For the prophetic movement in Israel was beyond all comparison the greatest spiritual achievement of the pre-Christian world, and the rediscovery of the true interpretation and significance of that movement was unquestionably one of the greatest intellectual achievements of the nineteenth century.

Dr. Robinson begins by showing that only upon Hebrew soil could the way for Jesus have been prepared. Then, after discussing the two religions of Israel—the purer nomadic form of Yahweh-worship, represented in the main by the south and the east, and the agricultural type prevalent in the north and deeply infected by Canaanitish Baalism—he proceeds to deal, in a highly interesting fashion, with the early ecstatic prophets, throwing out the important suggestion that ecstasy, which 'does not seem to have been a part of the common heritage of the Semitic race,' was possibly of Hittite origin. Then he passes before us in succession the personalities, messages, and methods of the prophets, major and minor, making us feel that ecstasy played a larger part throughout than we are apt to imagine, and dropping incidentally the useful reminder that part of the greatness of the great Servant (or Slave, as he calls him) of Yahweh in the famous Songs is that he rose above the ecstatic and spectacular and did his prophetic work in quiet and unobtrusive ways. The story is then carried on to the period of eschatological prophecy, which is, in some aspects, a reversion to an earlier type.

Prophecy abounds in unsolved problems, and Professor Robinson has contributed perhaps as much as any man in the English-speaking world towards the solution of some of them. He has made it highly probable that ecstasy played a large part in the demeanour, not only of the so-called 'false' prophets, but even of the canonical prophets, of men like Amos and Jeremiah. 'Thus *saith* Yahweh' should more properly be rendered 'Thus *said* Yahweh,' and the brief oracle that follows is strictly the recollection of the oracle delivered in ecstatic mood. Second sight and second hearing were, generally speaking, characteristic of the prophets, and both are illustrated in the great vision of Isaiah. The consequences of this view are obviously profound, one of them being that the prophetic messages are briefer and more fragmentary, and the collections represented by the books are ultimately more disconnected, than many have been in the habit of believing.

The book reads very smoothly. There is no parade of learning, but everywhere we feel the skilful guidance of one who knows all the ground, and has traversed it repeatedly and independently. Dr. Robinson is not afraid to go his own way, and his discussion is full, not only of good things, but of fresh things. He is not afraid to suggest, for example, that Hosea was a man of the city, perhaps a baker by trade. In opposition to many modern scholars he believes that the attitude of the pre-Exilic prophets to sacrifice might have been different had the ritual been purer than it was, and he believes that the Servant of Yahweh songs, which he regards as possibly not coming from the pen of Deutero-Isaiah, are not to be interpreted individually, but as embodying 'the character of the ideal slave of Yahweh.'

The book is a really fresh discussion of a well-worn theme, stimulating alike to mind and heart. Appended is a valuable Bibliography on Prophecy by Professor Peake.

THE DOMINANT SEX.

The present century has been characterized by gradual but marked advance towards the equality of women and men in the spheres both of public law and public life, not only throughout the British Empire and the United States of America, but in other countries. There are signs of change even in Muhammadan States and in far eastern lands like China and Japan. There have been many stages, but a steady progress towards free entrance into every avenue of daily labour, though the final goal is not yet won.

But there is nothing new under the sun. Civilization is not a thing of yesterday and to-day. It is ages old, and in other times and among other races —*e.g.*, the people of Egypt and the times of Tut-ankh-amen just brought before us so vividly— there were other manners and customs. One has only to read the records of the most primitive and the most civilized peoples alike, as they are to be found in the pages of such a comprehensive work as the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, to realize that both have their lessons for us. 'When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?' is the question that Socialism is asking to-day. We have now another question in a volume just published entitled *The Dominant Sex:* A Study in the Sociology of Sex Differentiation (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). This is the translation by Eden and Cedar Paul of a German work by Mathilde and Mathias Vaerting. We are told that this is a pioneer work in its endeavour to prove that there have been States in the world's history in which women have been as dominant in the control of family and of public affairs as men are to-day. In both States it is the women's function, of course, to bear children, but in the Women's State it is the men who nurse and rear the children and take upon them all the drudgery of domestic work. We do not know if in the Women's State there was ever any difficulty in getting male domestic servants as in the Men's State of to-day there is a scarcity of women domestics. 'We may assume,' say the authors of this book, 'that the upper-class men of the Women's State must have led a life no less slothful than that with which we ourselves are so familiar in the case of the upper-class women of the Men's State. Among the well-to-do, even to-day, the men have, as a rule, some active occupation away from home, whereas their womenkind lead a life of absolute inertia, not even doing any housework. . . . A foreign visitor to a Women's State would derive the converse impression and would think that the women worked while the men lazed.' 'The women of the Women's State,' they say, 'have very different physical aptitudes from those possessed by the women of the contemporary Men's State. Where woman rules she is no less superior to man in bodily capacity than man is superior to woman in this respect where man holds sway. It is home work, in especial, that impairs bodily fitness. . . . As women acquire equal rights their physical fitness increases. . . . We have, therefore, adequate grounds for the opinion that women's physique has had nothing to do, as cause, with the division of labour between the sexes.'

It is impossible to follow the authors into their history of the dominance of women in ancient Egypt and parts of Greece and among many Indian primitive peoples. This investigation has been a prolonged and careful one, embracing many different phases of the subject. The results, such as they are, seem to point to the conclusion that a civilization which offers equality of opportunity to both sexes will work out the greatest good for the greatest number.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO-DAY.

In spite of all that has been written and spoken about the League of Nations, it is doubtful how far public opinion is well informed on the subject. An admirable handbook has now been published which deserves to be widely read. Its title is *The League of Nations To-day*, by Roth Williams (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). The book has a threefold aim, to describe the structure and working of the League, to give an account of its main achievements, and to indicate how Britain should use the League for the resettlement of Europe and the world. The writer is an enthusiastic believer in the League as the best instrument for the reconstruction of Europe and the surest bulwark of the peace of the world, and it may be heartily admitted that he makes a good case.

The League of Nations has sometimes been belittled as if it were merely a philanthropic associa-

tion like the Save the Children Fund; sometimes it has been abused as if it were an omnipotent superstate, able, if it chose, to deal effectively with all international questions. Its true constitution and powers are here carefully set down, so that one may see both what it can and what it cannot do. Already the League has a creditable record of good work done. The settlement of the Aaland Islands, the repatriation of war prisoners, the service rendered by its health organization, its regulations in regard to opium and the traffic in women and children, are work of the sort that appeals to the heart of humanity. When the writer comes to deal with the League in relation to British foreign policy he plunges into the burning questions of the day—the Ruhr, the recognition of Russia, the attitude of the United States, etc. In this region he will not expect his views to meet with universal acceptance, but he shows sound judgment and thorough competence in handling these difficult problems. Britain's policy is in various respects criticised, yet after all her record in connexion with the League of Nations is comparatively not so bad. 'The League was our chief aim in the war, and both during and after the Peace Conference the British Government, bad as its record is in the light of any but the most modest standards, has done relatively better than any other government—has proved less niggardly in financing League activities, less unready to refer questions to the League for settlement, and less dilatory in carrying out League decisions. Public opinion in England, too, has been less ignorant and apathetic about the League than in any other country. . . . Finally, there is no parallel elsewhere to the way all parties at the last general election pledged themselves up to the hilt to the League, and many candidates made the League one of their main planks.'

OUT-OF-DATE AMERICA.

A wave of old-fashioned orthodoxy, quite curiously obscurantist, gathered in 1921, and has been sweeping across the United States ever since. Matters that with us were settled centuries ago are being questioned yonder with a passionate vehemence and by arguments that are mediæval. 'In the City of Zion (Illinois) the school children are compelled by theological authority, expressed through the civil government, to learn that the earth is flat "like a pie, surrounded by a circle of water, inclosed by an outer circle of impenetrable ice!"' In Kentucky a teacher was dismissed for teaching that the earth is round; and a court of law supported the school board in this action, on the ground that such teaching is contrary to the plain statement of Scripture, and therefore to fact. A Congress of seven hundred delegates from twenty-six States seems to have agreed to withhold all financial support from those guilty of the heresy of evolution! And big men are in it. Is not Mr. William Jennings Bryan one of the most pronounced and energetic critics of an evolutionary origin of man, and that on the most narrow dogmatic grounds? Even the theological colleges, or some of them, are disturbed by the clamour. Thus Mr. H. H. Lane, the Professor of Zoology in Kansas University, was asked by the theological students at one college to tell them 'what is the theory of evolution, and what are the important facts on which it is based; and what effect the acceptance of that theory has upon one's views of the Biblical account of creation and of the Christian Religion.'

It is astonishing that there is a part of the intelligent world still at that stage! Yet these students, if slow in making up their minds on some things, are shrewd fellows. For they chose a wholly admirable guide; and he has written a queerly belated but wholly admirable book—*Evolution and Christian Faith* (Milford; 9s. net). Here is the full knowledge of an expert joined to a gift of writing interestingly, with no dull pages.

And yet, highly to be commended though it is, it is not so fascinating as the problem that lies behind it—Why is America, that prides itself upon its go-aheadness, in some respects the limping laggard of the world?

When that doughty fighter, Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, espouses any cause he does so with his whole being, throwing in everything he has, and striking to kill. So it is in his latest book—*War: Its Nature, Cause, and Cure* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). He has a great purpose, and he flings himself into it with a shuddering horror of all war, and a terror of the chemical devilries which he sees with truth will certainly mark the next, unless men's minds can be weaned from the whole imbecility in time. Here is all the rush and passion of pleading of a

man deeply moved and utterly in earnest. And one wishes him God-speed. But the book is less convincing than it might have been. Had it been more quietly written it would have been likelier to impress those to whom it is addressed; and, even more, if Mr. Dickinson had not ventured on history, giving with assurance a detailed reading of the last twenty years or so. And history, thank God, is not his strong point. For, accept this account, and there were nothing for it but to conclude that this world is a mere gibbering madhouse, and humanity a dupe so silly and so sordid that it almost deserves to be fooled. It is a really dreadful earth that Mr. Dickinson sees: but, happily, the value of his reading of things can be gauged by the one gleam of unconscious humour in a wholly solemn book, 'America, and America alone, was disinterested. She was not proposing to get anything out of the war.'

There is a marked contrast between Professor Peet's book, which was reviewed last month, and *The Oldest Letters in the World tell us—What?* by Mrs. Sydney Bristowe (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). 'My firm belief,' 'my conviction,' 'my contention,' are favourite expressions in the latter. Written in a 'frankly controversial' spirit, it clashes with the findings of recognized authorities at every point. We can appreciate the author's position by this statement of creed: 'Believing that, in the Apostle Paul's words, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," I take the Bible as my key to ancient history.' Her thesis may be said to be 'the Tel-el-Amarna tablets elucidated by the Bible.' In this consists the true witness, whereas the false witness of the pagan priests of Amenhotep's and Dusratta's countries is unmasked in the Tablets. Startling theories are propounded, and startling equations are reached. The Haberi are the Israelites who, under the leadership of Joshua (Canaanite name: Abdasherah), conquered Palestine and Phœnicia, including Tyre and Sidon. The Phœnicians are Israelites, and their descendants are now to be found in Britain (another link having been added to the chain of evidence). The Canaanites, the 'accursed race', are accorded no place, and in the same way the 'Great Hittite Empire'—'in the light of Bible prophecy impossible'—disappears. 'Subbiluliuma did not exist at all.' The name is but a variant of Dusratta of Mitanni, who is also to be identified with Tarkhundarush. Just as certain Biblical figures (*e.g.* Joshua, Adonibezek) suddenly emerge in well-known Tablet personages, so other figures, even kingly, are called in question: 'Can we believe, for instance, in the existence of the three kings called respectively, Sakere, Tut-enkhamen and Eye, who are believed to have reigned in succession after Amenhotep the fourth, but whose united reigns only lasted, according to Professor Breasted about eight years and whose names do not inspire confidence.'

This sentence is reproduced as it stands, to show how defective is the punctuation of the book.

'The contemporary priests . . . have successfully befogged ancient history.' The arguments of the book aim at convincing readers of this; 'let them tell me where they think me wrong' (part of motto [Samuel Johnson], preceding Chapter I.).

No index is provided.

What is to be done with the adolescent who escapes from school imperfectly educated and is not absorbed into steady employment? He often drifts into unskilled work with good money, but it is a dead end, and he is left at sixteen or seventeen without a trade and with the habit of steady learning gone out of his head. The Day Continuation School was set up to solve this problem, and its object is both to develop the adolescent himself, body and mind, and to train him into a good citizen and efficient worker. How it is doing this, how it may do it better, what is wanted to make these schools more efficient, and how other nations are facing the problem—all this is dealt with in *The Day Continuation School in England*, by Edith Anna Waterfall (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is a thorough and able piece of work, engrossing in its interest, and dealing in a competent fashion with a problem which is vital for the welfare of the nation and the world.

It is often suggested that the present is not a religious age. We do not go to church as our fathers did, it is said. We have cast off many of our fathers' beliefs. And so on. Most of this is untrue or exaggerated. At any rate, it cannot be denied that this is an inquiring age, deeply interested in problems of faith and wistfully seeking assurance. A significant indication of this is the fact that the *Times* newspaper publishes every Saturday an article on some topic of moral or religious interest.

A selection of these articles has been made by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D., and published under the title *Life's True Values* (Allenson; 5s. net), and they are well worth permanent preservation. Every side of life and truth is presented here with a freshness of treatment and a fertility and originality that make the reading of them a delight. The topic is suggested by the passing occasion—a day in the Church Year, the holiday season, the New Year, or any other event. And the anonymous writers have always something suggestive and inspiring to say; the standpoint is frankly Christian, and though theology in the technical sense is avoided there is always a robust faith in the background.

One great lesson religious teachers may learn from this book. The deepest themes are always discussed in plain language. And the lesson is needed, for the most frequent and most deserved criticism of the pulpit to-day is that preachers use language which is not familiar to their hearers. There is, on the other hand, something home-coming in the 'secular' style of these essays. They might well be taken in this respect as a model.

If Nature's treasure-house were not inexhaustible, it could not provide material for the innumerable talks and parables which are poured out for the instruction and delight of the children of to-day. *A Garden of Beautiful Stories*, by William J. May (Allenson; 5s. net), contains thirty-six nature parables and stories written with true insight into the heart of a child. The writer has the dramatic instinct and the real story-teller's gift. His work is touched with fine imagination and sympathy. Children will be captivated by these delightful parables, and teachers will find them full of suggestion.

Mr. Bryan has raised 'some' storm in America by his crusade against Darwinism. Doubtless good will come out of it, for 'the controversy which he provoked sent multitudes of inquirers to the libraries and book stores who had probably never before read anything of a serious nature on evolution.' Hay Watson Smith, Pastor of Second Presbyterian Church, Little Rock, Arkansas, has published a big pamphlet, *Evolution and Presbyterianism* (Allsopp & Chapple), to instruct his people in the question at issue. His method is to quote at great length opinions of distinguished Scots Presbyterians favourable to evolution. 'Why no American Presbyterians? The answer is that, for the purposes of this pamphlet, there are none to quote—none that are at all representative.' The curious *a fortiori* conclusion is drawn, 'If representative Presbyterian ministers find nothing in evolution that is incompatible with Presbyterianism, nothing will be found in it that is inconsistent with Christianity—a very much simpler thing!' To us the pamphlet is significant for the sidelight it throws on American theological thought.

Within the compass of eighty short pages the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D., tells in clear and simple language all that the ordinary reader needs to know about the difficult but highly important *Book of Hosea*; Revised Version for Schools (Cambridge University Press; 2s.). The writer has made good use of Sir George Adam Smith and Melville Scott's 'Message of Hosea.' The introduction deals with the historical background and the prophet's message, and the commentary is adequate. Dr. Crafer believes broadly in the integrity of the book, and therefore, unlike some recent critics, regards the hopeful passages as integral to the message of Hosea.

If publishers would only believe it, the blowing of trumpets on the wrapper of a book is a mistake! Frankly we were prejudiced against *God's Freemen*, by Professor N. Micklem, M.A. (James Clarke; 5s. net). But we were wrong. It is a fine healthy book that acts like a tonic. In the beginning it is somewhat after the style of 'Men of the Covenant.' Not that it is anything like as good. But then Dr. Smellie was almost a genius, and very certainly was a real stylist. Professor Micklem, too, can write, and he takes us through a picture gallery of spiritual heroes, somewhat oddly chosen. And then, gathering his force together, and looking out on the world of our own day with kind and fearless eyes, he urges us to prove our Protestantism, as those men did before us, by facing wrongs, and overthrowing shams, and exercising our liberty. This is a rapid, vivid, healthy book.

The Rev. F. W. Aveling, M.A., B.Sc., minister of the Congregational Church at St. Neots, has written an account of his own Christian beliefs which will be read with interest and respect. It bears the brief title *Credo* (James Clarke; 5s. net). The author rightly holds that there is a keen demand to-day

for positive statements on truth, and he endeavours to meet this demand by a frank discussion of fundamental problems. The Existence of God, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Miracles, Immortality, Pain, and Future Punishment are the subjects of successive chapters which are all alike characterized by independent and fearless writing. The standpoint is a moderate and enlightened orthodoxy, but the author has his own thoughts, and these are not always conventional. There is a sincerity and an earnestness in the treatment of difficult questions that will impress and captivate the inquiring mind, and these contributions to a reasonable Christian apologetic will help to establish and enlighten doubting spirits.

The Pulpit and the Children (James Clarke ; 3s. 6d. net) contains seventy-two very brief addresses to the young by the Rev. Robert Hill, M.A., of Renfrew. Mr. Hill was a fellow-student with Principal Sir George Adam Smith, who in a foreword to these addresses writes : ' They have confirmed what I have always felt about Mr. Hill, that he has preserved the simplicity and freshness of his youth better than any of his contemporaries.' Mr. Hill does not attempt to elaborate his text. He is content to illustrate it by brief but pointed stories. His purpose is to suggest what others—preachers and teachers and parents—may elaborate in their own way.

The subject of Autosuggestion is interesting on its psychological side, but it is even more interesting on its practical side as a method of healing. This practical side is expounded fully and in a most interesting fashion in a new book with the title *Self-Healing by Autosuggestion,* by M. A. Dolonne (Dent ; 3s. 6d. net). The exposition is clear and simple. First of all the writer explains the nature of autosuggestion, then he discusses the elements of which it is composed, and finally he describes the conditions requisite for its fruitful practice. Great claims are made for the method, and stories of healing are told to substantiate the claims. M. Dolonne devotes many pages to explaining the influence of the mind on the body, and bases the new method on this acknowledged fact. It will be enough to say that the book is a plain, straightforward account of M. Coué's theory and practice, and that any one wishing to know ' how it is done ' will find it all expounded here.

The Creed in the Papal Mass, by C. E. Roney-Dougal, Esq., M.A. (Dyte, Bath ; 3d.), is a pamphlet on the creeds. The author is dissatisfied with the Papal form, and gives his reasons with some minuteness. There is also a curiously old-fashioned dedication to Lord Birkenhead.

Thy Love and Thy Grace, by Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. (Herder ; 6s. net), is an eight days' retreat. It is intended specifically for those bound by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. But it is hoped that priests generally, and even the devout laity, may find the book helpful. This is likely to be the case. Much ground is reverently covered ; and our minds are concentrated on the deepest and most central things. And if to Protestants some things here and there feel far away, they must still wish that this earnest work of a devout mind may have every success.

In England and Scotland alike the dominant subject of interest at present in Church life is the prospect of union. In Scotland the prospect is entirely favourable, for between the two great Presbyterian Churches there remains no obstacle that involves principle. In England the difficulties might appear nearly insurmountable. But even there ' it moves.' The Lambeth Appeal created a new situation, and the Joint Committee of Representatives from the various Churches have found some common ground. In order to explore this more fully a series of meetings was held in London at which prominent men from these Churches expounded the point of view they represented, and these discussions have now been published under the title *The Lambeth Joint Report on Church Unity : A Discussion* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 3s. 6d. net). The aim was to help in the creation of a ' common mind ' out of which greater things may come. The contributors are the Archbishop of York, Dr. W. B. Selbie, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. Carnegie Simpson, and Bishop Headlam. The essays are most interesting and valuable, and the frank and generous expression of varied standpoints is certain to advance the great cause which all the writers have at heart.

The Creed for the Twentieth Century, by C. G. Harrison (Longmans ; 4s. 6d. net), is the work of a convinced, not to say bigoted, high churchman. The aim of the author is ' the correction of a false, though widely prevalent, impression, that the

advance of knowledge, and especially discoveries in the realms of physical science within the last hundred years, have made it impossible for intelligent persons to hold in the twentieth century beliefs about God and His relation to the phenomenal Universe which satisfied our simple forefathers.' This is excellent, and the work might have been so done as to earn the gratitude of all Christians. But at the outset the reader is met with the blunt assertion that the divine purpose is carried out by a society 'the Catholic Church, represented in this country by the Church of England. This society is easily recognized by certain marks distinguishing it from all other *soi-disant* Christian bodies.'

The author's reading of Church history can hardly lay claim to scientific accuracy. 'For a thousand years the Church of the Kingdom of God was undivided. This was the first Millennium or reign of Christ on earth.' Economic conditions in the Middle Ages are represented as having been almost ideal. But 'with the Reformation, which was conceived in lust and born of oppression, all this came to an end. . . . After a false dawn in the reign of Charles I. under Laud, this country became wholly delivered over to idolatry.' The fate reserved for Protestantism is to 'wither and die of its own inherent absurdity,' though on another page the extraordinary suggestion is made that 'there is reason to think that Protestantism will sooner or later make common cause with Mohammedanism and modern Judaism.'

From a mind which views Christian history in this wise little is to be hoped in the way of a persuasive presentation of the articles of the creed. Never once does the writer succeed in coming into sympathetic touch with the modern mind. From the summit of his high tower of orthodoxy he looks out upon an unbelieving world and sternly sounds the trumpet of recall. Difficulties he handles with but thinly veiled impatience. Regarding the Resurrection 'it is difficult to understand how it can be reasonably denied, or even doubted, except on *a priori* grounds, which, whatever weight they may have carried a generation ago, do not commend themselves to the more enlightened reason of the twentieth century. No one doubts that Charles I. was beheaded at Whitehall on January 30, 1649, and the evidence for the Resurrection is at least as good.' Is the matter really so simple?

It is hard to imagine any educated mind being impressed by work of this sort, and the reader is left with a dreary sense of the ponderous obstacles which dogmatic churchism continues to pile up, not merely in the path of Christian reunion, but in the way of faith itself.

God with Us, by E. J. Bodington (Longmans; 2s. net), is a series of short studies in divine immanence. Having been originally delivered as lectures to the London Girls' Diocesan Association, they are simple and lucid, yet well informed and deeply thoughtful. The method of the book is historical, and it throbs with a passion for Christ. One may be dubious of some of the opinions expressed, as when it is said, 'there are some people who, it seems, are unable to be religiously converted. If people have not the religious faculty, they must try to be good all the same.' Or again, 'Men and women will crowd into the Church as soon as ever they believe that Christ's own principles are taught and acted upon.' The writer, with pleasing modesty, doubts whether these lectures are worthy of publication; let him be assured that his little book has more sap and marrow in it than many a more imposing volume.

A Liturgy was issued in 1920 for use in the Indian Church. It was compiled by private persons as an experiment, and was entitled 'The Eucharist in India.' A general approval was given to this form by a committee of the Lambeth Conference along with certain suggestions of improvements. These were supplemented by further contributions from friends, and the result has been a revision of the original form, which is now issued in a beautifully printed pamphlet with the title *An Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). This revised liturgy has been tentatively sanctioned by the Episcopal Synod of India for experimental use in the diocese of Bombay, and experience will determine its value and place in the permanent worship of the Church in India.

Pulling Together, by John T. Broderick (Robson & Adee, U.S.A.; $2), which has gone through several editions since its publication a year ago, has now been reprinted with a sequel. It is a most pleasant and readable account of the experiences of a big firm in the Middle West which has introduced employee representation into its management with the happiest results. The failure of autocracy, whether on the part of Employer or of Trades Union, is demonstrated, and misunderstandings are

shown to be due largely to lack of mutual knowledge. With the coming together of directors and employees in friendly conference a new and sweeter atmosphere was generated, production was increased, and economies were effected, while wages and profits advanced together in happy union. The principle is emphasized that 'production is essentially an orderly, peaceful process—one in which normally there is no place for disputes. . . . We are positively ashamed of disputes, as a decent man is of a family row.' The underlying ideal is frankly Christian. 'The most practical business concepts there are were enunciated two thousand years ago, and the needful things of life would be much more abundant for all classes than they now are if the Prince of Peace, with His sane and simple program of mutual service, were also accepted universally as the Prince of Industry.'

The writer of *The Exodus in the Light of Archæology*, Mr. J. S. Griffiths (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net), has made out a very good case from the conservative standpoint, and his book deserves to be read. That he will not win universal assent to his solution of the problem goes without saying. If his verdict be taken in conjunction with Professor Peet's (in 'Egypt and the Old Testament'), a good idea will be conveyed of the opposite beliefs current on the question of the date of the Exodus. In view of this disagreement the average reader must still preserve an open mind.

The author admits the need for textual criticism, the discrepancies and difficulties of the text of the Old Testament, and the possibility that a whole section (Nu 10^{11}–21^{13}) is out of place. He rejects the documentary theory, and attaches himself to the Library theory of H. M. Wiener, whom he follows throughout.

The thesis of the book, 'Is it possible to determine the precise date of the Exodus?' is answered thus: 'The *second* year of Meneptah (1233–2 B.C., Petrie's dating) will fit all the facts, and it is the only one that will do so.' The Conclusion states: 'Our task is done. The problem has been solved.'

There is an additional note (p. 79) on Dr. Gardiner's articles, called 'A,' on p. 45. Additional notes 'B' and 'C' are also referred to, but they have not been found.

Take with you Words, by Rev. S. J. Rowton (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net), is intended primarily as a manual for the use of ordination candidates, but it should prove extremely helpful to all preachers and public readers of Scripture. It deals with matters of pronunciation, phrasing, emphasis, and the like. It contains numerous examples of the errors into which the careless or unwary reader is apt to fall. Interesting light is thrown on many texts, though it is not to be expected that the writer's judgment will be always followed. Probably few would accept the reading of I AM THAT I AM as being analogous to 'Art thou that Moses,' and as bearing the meaning of 'I am that well known I AM.'

But it is an admirable little book, packed full of sound advice. Take this on preaching: 'To a man who is going to take a service in Church the first piece of advice to be given is that he should be perfectly natural—should speak as at other times, without the slightest strain on the organs of utterance. It is a good working rule that whatever vocal tone is produced easily is produced rightly, whereas any noticeable effort shows that there is something wrong. All affectation, every kind of mannerism, must be severely repressed. . . . It is only by misusing it in some way that speakers get what is called the parson's sore throat.'

In *Grasps of Guess*, by Mr. Gerald H. Paulet, B.A. (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net), we have another effort to help the ordinary man who is not satisfied with the ancient creeds of the Church as they stand to think his own way to belief with the aid of his personal experience. The position is perhaps indicated best by a quotation. 'The Church is not a land-locked harbour wherein the soul may rest at careless ease, without effort of thought or desire of discovery; but rather it is a wide, strong-built shelter, thrusting out to the open, wherein the little bark may steal for safe anchorage, only on the condition, however, that she prove sea-worthy and ready to face the dangers of the deep.'

Taking the creeds as a working hypothesis the author invites us to launch out, not only into speculative thought, but also into deep personal Christian experience. The old problems of Divine Intervention, Free-will, The Inspiration of the Bible, The Trinity, Eternal Punishment, Immortality, etc., are dealt with in the form of letters to a friend. Technical terms of theology and philosophy are generally avoided or popularly defined, and whether one agrees with the conclusions or not there is

always something to stimulate thought. Moreover, in all the letters one is made to feel that he is getting the fruits of the author's own deep experience, resulting in the conviction, often repeated, that the solution of all these problems is to be found in a fuller personal realization of the infinite love of God in Jesus Christ.

Dr. Percy Dearmer must be a delightful person. Here is the second volume of his *Lessons on the Way* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) to prove it once again. Reynolds once wrote that a painting should not only be well done, but it should seem to have been done easily. And here is that difficult art, speaking to young folk, carried through with such success that there seems to be no difficulty about it—till one tries again for oneself! It is true that Dr. Dearmer does not talk to the young directly, but through their teachers. But that is even harder, as anybody will admit. One great recommendation is that he goes straight to the central things. The temptation is, of course, to stay on the circumference. It is so much easier to talk about aeroplanes or beetles, with some more or less apt application to things spiritual towards the close. But Dr. Dearmer boldly speaks for a whole year about the Creed, shirks nothing, and does it so interestingly that it will be an odd boy who, listening, has any dull moments. He has a mass of new and apt illustrations, used with judgment. But what gives the book its success is two things—his knowledge of the great truths he is teaching, and the young mind he is addressing—that and his own personality, with its breeziness and its humour and its downright directness. He is not afraid to go far. 'It is so important to understand the jolly doctrine of God's Fatherhood.' But let nobody mistake! The characteristic of the book is its author's reverence for God, and those he teaches ought to catch the infection of that.

Visitors to museums would be well advised to prepare themselves 'for seeing Egyptian things intelligently' by aid of Mrs. A. A. Quibell's *Egyptian History and Art* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). This is a work of outstanding merit, whose usefulness has been already tested (for Cairo Museum), produced by one who has carefully equipped herself by residence at the very centre of things, and who is thoroughly conversant with the contents of museums the whole world over. The volume is far from being of the ordinary catalogue order. It is a continuous narrative of Egyptian history, with special reference to art, from earliest times down to the Arab conquest (3600 B.C.–A.D. 642), presented in a form readily intelligible to all, and at the same time marked by the enthusiasm of the expert. Sound judgment characterizes the whole book, and on debatable points—*e.g.* the date of the Exodus—praiseworthy restraint is exercised. 'There are difficulties about both theories' [earlier and later dating], she says, 'and though we may lean to one rather than to the other, it is better to admit that the question can hardly be answered satisfactorily on the facts as they are known at present.'

The up-to-date character of the book is apparent in the passages (Preface, etc.) bearing on the Tut-ankh-amen find. Judging from the summary here given we may look to Mrs. Quibell to do full justice to this theme when opportunity arises. Enough is said to show that she adequately realizes the artistic merit of the furniture discovered. 'The historical importance of the discovery is probably not very great, but it is rather too soon to affirm anything positively about this.'

These are but two items selected from a volume brimful of interest throughout. The illustrations in the text are excellent and are clearly explained. Fifteen photographic plates appended enhance the value of the book.

The Desire of All Nations, by W. H. Seddon (Elliot Stock; 5s. net), has for its sub-title 'Christ and Reconstruction.' This opens a very wide field. The author's method is historical, and he shows competent scholarship throughout. He deals with the person and work of Christ in relation to the Kingdom of God, and briefly outlines the development of the Kingdom. His spirit, though dispassionate, is firmly Protestant and democratic. Rome is the heir of ancient pagan imperialism, and the hope of the nations lies in a world-wide democracy owning allegiance to Christ. And if a 'Moral Metropolis' is needed, 'neither Geneva, nor the Hague, nor any other European city is ideally suited for the purpose; for the new Unity must be larger than Europe. It must embrace the New World as well as the Old, and must extend from East to West. There is no city in the world which possesses the cosmopolitan sanctity and prestige of Jerusalem; and it bears already the ideal title of "The City of Peace."'

The deepest and most urgent question of the seeking soul is: 'How can I be sure of God?' and this question Principal W. J. Moulton, M.A., B.D., of Didsbury College, Manchester, sets out to answer in an admirable little book, published by the Student Christian Movement—*The Certainty of God* (3s. 6d. net). Its central contention is that 'when all possible allowance has been made for what we have gained from our education, from the society in which we live, and from our inherited beliefs, we are brought, in the last resort, face to face with a living God, and that throughout our lives we may receive:

Authentic tidings of invisible things.'

In nine chapters of close but clear argument he proceeds step by step to make good his contention, dealing with the fact of Christ, Christ and History, Sin as a reality, the Meaning of the Cross, Conversion, and the Social Consequences of Salvation. The whole treatment is extraordinarily good, and we cannot think of any book better suited to its purpose of presenting the case for the Christian religion to a young and inquiring mind.

An admirable review of the work done by the World's Student Christian Federation during the past year is published under the title *Under Heaven One Family* (World's Student Christian Federation; 6d.). The Federation has a membership of over a quarter of a million present students, and the British Student Movement is only one of many bodies included in it. The present report records faithfully the aims of the Federation, emphasizing its definitely Christian character, and reveals the wide and statesmanlike scope of its efforts. There is an interesting section on the Peking Conference, whose watchword gives the title to this report, and special stress is laid on the international aspect of the Federation's operations. The review might be summarized in the phrase which dominated the Peking meetings: 'Jesus Christ and World Reconstruction.' Copies of this report may be obtained from the Student Christian Movement Bookroom, London.

The Breaking-Point.

By the Reverend John A. Hutton, D.D., London.

'If I say, I will speak thus; behold, I should offend against the generation of thy children.'—Ps 73[15].

You always find the conclusion of a psalm at the beginning. You always find the last word, the result of all the travail, at the very outset. You only need to think for a moment of how a psalm, like any other outpouring of the human soul, comes to be written in order to see that what the man thought *last* he would write *first*.

You will find, if you recall the psalms which are familiar to most of us, that this is not any ingenuity of my own. 'The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.' That is a conclusion: thereafter the Psalmist gives you the process by which that conclusion was reached. 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the mountains,' says the writer of the 121st Psalm, which once again is obviously a conclusion, written by one who discovered that what had been wrong with him was that he had *not* been lifting up his eyes to the hills; he had been going about the world with his eyes anywhere but on the hills: and so, lest he should forget it later on, he begins his psalm by committing himself beyond himself.

That, by the way, is a very ordinary introduction to a psalm. A good man sees that there is something which he ought to commit himself to, something which he must abandon or something which he must take up, and, lest he should lose his moral purpose in the rhetoric of his emotional mood, he pledges himself at the very beginning. He vows himself to something and confesses that if he fails *there* he will have put himself beyond the pale. Thus it is that you have any number of psalms which begin with 'I will'; and only thereafter does the good man tell you how it was that he needed so to commit himself.

I confess quite frankly that there are some psalms, and these almost the greatest, which arrive at no conclusion at all, where the poor soul after all his restless tossing seems at the end to see not one whit more clearly, or to feel more comfortable within himself and face to face with life. And I repeat,

these are the psalms which in my own view are the deepest and the dearest—where no conclusions at all are arrived at, where you simply see some man vexed and broken about life pouring out his heart; and at the end, so far as we see, he has no further light. Now, why do I say that these are the psalms which in my own view are the deepest and dearest? Victor Hugo in *Les Misérables*, in his description of that incomparably good man, the bishop, says amongst other things this: 'He was one of those men who could sit for a whole hour beside a man who had lost his wife—and say nothing.' Now there are psalms in which I seem to see God simply sitting down by the side of some one who is heart-broken, allowing that one to say all sorts of wild, hard, rebellious things, knowing that it is good for the soul to rid itself of such perilous stuff. In those psalms I see God *listening*, allowing us to have it all out. Perhaps the fact that we can have it all out in a desperate hour is proof that beneath the surface and in the world of the Spirit there is a breast of God.

Well, this psalm is not one of those. This psalm arrives at a conclusion which, let me say again, you find at the outset. And the conclusion is a confession. It begins: 'Truly God is good to Israel.' The man is rebuking himself for having thought otherwise. And then he proceeds to tell us how he himself had been to blame. 'As for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped.' The psalm, that is to say, begins with a confession by a man that he very nearly did something which he thanks God he did not do; that he was on the point of going over a precipice of some kind, and he thanks God that something occurred to keep him back from its dizzy edge.

Now there is no more lyrical moment in the life of the human soul than the moment when we perceive that we have escaped from something. For those are the great moments in life which have still a touch of their opposite in them. The most lyrical time in any one's life is a time of escape, a time when we pass out of one condition which threatened us into another condition in which we are liberated. That is the condition of this man. He begins by confessing that he very nearly did something which he did not do, very nearly thought something which he did not express, very nearly went over some precipice from which he thanks God he was delivered.

Let me dwell for a moment on that symbol of slipping and almost going over a precipice. I remember long ago being in the Isle of Rousay in the Orkneys, which, like all the islands of the western sea, stands up sheer out of the ocean like a kind of table. On the side that faces the Atlantic, the Island of Rousay is precipitous. It is being eaten into by the sea, and in course of time it collapses bit by bit. When you are on the level of the water looking landwards you can see great galleries receding away into the heart of the island, while all around you

> The ceaseless billows on the ocean's breast
> Break like a bursting heart and die in foam,
> And thus at last find peace.

Walking across Rousay, you come across slits and cracks, some only a foot wide, some a yard wide, some ten yards wide, and some great gaps and chasms. The dangerous ones, obviously, are the narrow ones. Nobody thinks of trying to leap a ten-yard chasm, but many of us think we are able to leap a chasm about a foot wide. That is where the danger lies. If you look over the edge of such a chasm or slit you see the water writhing and wriggling away down beneath. Now, supposing a man almost slipped, almost missed his footing, but fell upon the other side, safe, just escaped. What an agony of happiness would be in that man's heart! And if as he rose he rested for a moment on his knees, and if he bethought himself of a psalm like this, surely he could get no better expression for his mood than this: 'My feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped.'

Well then, what was it this man so narrowly escaped? If I met a man in the street whose face was radiant, and if he told me that he had just escaped from something, I should conclude that he meant to say he had escaped from some moral transgression which would have publicly degraded him, or from something which would have embarrassed his life-interests. That is what we should think if a man who knew us told us, in confidence and breathlessly, that he had escaped from something which threatened him: we should suppose that he had felt the heat of some powerful temptation, and had almost yielded, but that something had intervened to distract him and to save him. Now the extraordinary and unique thing about this psalm is that this man who is thanking God so passionately for having escaped something, is not thinking about that kind of thing at all. What,

then, is it that he escaped from, for which he thanks God? I can only put it in this way. He thanks God *that he never yet adopted a low way of speaking about life*. But, you say, that is not much. Is it not? I say, weighing my words and in all sobriety, that it is a less heinous thing to fall from an ideal under the stress of some passion than not to be able to fall because you are down already. A low way of *thinking* about life is more disastrous to the human soul than a low way of *acting*, unless the low acting be simply the expression of the low thinking. I am perfectly sure, if we saw things as God sees them, we should feel that the one thing to be thankful for is that, in spite of life's stress and insinuations, we have not fallen into a low way of thinking about things, that we have not adopted the attitude of laughter and cynicism in this great world.

The good man proceeds to tell us how he was tempted to talk in a low way about life. It is the old story. He saw people whom he thought to be bad people getting on prosperously, and he saw people whom he knew to be good people not prospering at all. He describes it in his own inimitable way. 'They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. . . . Their eyes stand out with fatness: they have more than heart could wish.' They have no scruples about God, and if any good man speaks to them about God they adopt a superior tone, and say, 'Tush, how doth God know?'—as though to say, 'My dear sir, I am sorry to find you so out of date.' Such people often thereupon proceed to give us odds and ends about astronomy—the distance from Sirius to the moon, the number of millions of years it has taken to lay the red sandstone—why?—in order to browbeat simple people out of the faith that God in heaven cares anything about them. 'The thing is preposterous!' But perhaps all religion is preposterous from the purely intellectual point of view. But that need not worry us, for there is no purely intellectual point of view. It is a preposterous thing, if you start from some points of view, to believe that God the creator of heaven and earth cares for you and me; but that is why we believe it, and it is just the kind of thing we are here to die for.

Well, he describes these people. There they were with no troubles. Their children were never taken ill. Their investments never turned out wrongly. Things seemed always to go their way. At the same time he saw, or thought he saw, people who had their scruples, good people, having a bad time. As he thought about such things he became bitter; and, like all bitter people, he became not a little unjust. He supposed that all these rich people were having a happy time. He did not know that there is really not such a great difference between people when you know them. I myself have known rich people who had great sorrows, who lived with great simplicity, who to casual observers might have seemed proud and self-sufficient, who all the time were carrying some saving burden of pain, or grief. But when we are bitter we cannot do justice to anybody. This man by talking bitterly became more bitter, and by his own language darkened further this world already dark enough, until the awful idea offered itself to him that there is no such thing as goodness in the world, that the hypothesis of a final goodness at the heart of things is merely a desperate human cry. He tells us that as he pondered these people who had no scruples prospering, and the people who had scruples not prospering, he was almost coming to the conclusion that there is no difference between good and evil: his feet, in fact, had well-nigh slipped.

Now if we are right on the ultimate question we are right everywhere, and if we are wrong there we are wrong everywhere. I agree with Mr. Chesterton who is never so serious as when he appears to be merely amusing, that when he is arranging about rooms with a landlady, the first question he asks her is not what are her terms, but what is her total view of the universe; because, as Mr. Chesterton says with perfect cogency, if she is right there, she is right everywhere. In that case the coals will be right, the gas will be right, the food will be right; everything will be right if, to that woman, this world means God, and life means duty. She is right everywhere if her total view of the universe is right. But if her total view of the universe be cynical, that the moral order is something which you can dodge and manage, then because she is altogether wrong she is wrong everywhere.

Now that is what this good man very nearly committed himself to. He tells us he had come to think this; and he very nearly *said* it. But, you say, if a man thinks a thing he ought to say it. No: a thousand times! There are ten thousand things which come to us which we must never indulge by expressing. There are reminiscences in each of us of all sorts of things we have passed through. Waves of thought roll over us; yet in a sense we are not responsible for them. But if I *say* a thing,

then I have given the assent of my whole personality to that thing; I have made it my own. Thoughts come to me which I cry out against, and shudder at, protesting to God that they do not belong to me. But if I say a thing, no power on earth could have compelled me to say it unless in that region of the will where if anywhere I am myself I had assented.

Now this good man tells us that the thought or idea occurred to him and urged itself breathlessly upon him that the best way to deal with life is—to laugh at the whole thing; that there is nothing good or evil; that things are what they are, and that he is a wise man who will not allow a merely moral scruple to spoil his chances in life. He tells us he very nearly said *that*. But something stopped him. Now what was it that stopped him? Well, there was one thing that half stopped him. He said: 'But if I say this thing, if I say, "Surely I have cleansed my heart in vain and washed my hands in innocency"; if I say, "Surely I have been a fool to try to be a good man,"—then I should offend against the generation of God's children. I should have to turn my mother's portrait to the wall. If I take up this diabolical view of life, that there is nothing in it that relates a man to others and relates him to God, I shall be insulting the testimony of God's children through all ages and putting myself on the side not only of the sad ones but on the side of the bad ones.' That, I say, half stopped him. But he still went on thinking about it. The problem was not eased in his soul and he did not know what to say, until he did a very wonderful thing. *He rushed into a church:* 'I went into the sanctuary of God.'

There is great art in knowing *where* to put your questions. The fact is there is no real answer in terms of yes or no to any of life's final questions. But we may be brought into such circumstances that we do not want to ask such questions. There are certain questions which we do not ask in certain places. There are places—the surgical ward of some great hospital, or a theatre where some major operation is taking place—where we would be ashamed to ask any rebellious questions arising out of our own personal fortunes. Perhaps the final virtue of the Cross of Calvary is just there—that Christ died upon the cross to silence our mere querulousness; for we are ashamed to ask a merely bitter question about life face to face with Christ who without bitterness died upon the cross in love with God and men.

This man went into a church. We do not know what he saw in particular in that church, but in substance he would see just what he would see in any church. He might see some little children being dedicated, as with us in baptism, being brought to the temple as our Lord was brought to the temple in His babyhood, and held up in the arms of father and mother—being offered, as it were, to God. And as he looked at those little children, something may have gone soft within him—just as something went soft in that rich young ruler in the New Testament. For what softened the heart of that rich young ruler was that he saw Jesus laying His hands on little children. Afterwards, when Jesus had come away from the children, this rich young ruler, we are told, ran after Him. 'Master,' he said, 'what must *I* do to get into that kind of secret? I am only a rich man. There are things I can buy. There are even people I can buy. But I learned a moment ago when I saw Thee stand in the sun with those children that there are some things that money cannot buy. Tell me, good Master, how *I* can get there.'

It may have been something like that which softened his heart. Or he may have seen some old saint praying in the darkness, such as we might see any day in a Continental cathedral. But, whatever he saw, one big thing came into his mind. He said—these people are right or there is nothing right. They may be wrong in all sorts of ways, in manners and in speech. But they are finally right. In any case I had rather be wrong with them than right with those proud and swelling creatures whose prosperity is indeed the enormous shadow blasting life. Now, that is faith, for faith is the victory over the world.

Thereafter this man did something which none of us does often enough or thoroughly enough. He took himself out a walk; and there and then said things to himself which no one would have dared to say. 'The spirit of a man,' says the Bible, 'is the candle of the Lord.' What you, in the depths of your soul, can say about yourself is what God is going to say about you later on. In the end of the days God is going to say nothing about you that you would not say about yourself now if you had the courage. It is a deep and awesome saying, that the spirit of a man is the candle of the Lord. Suppose all the lights in the church were extinguished, and I were to bring in a candle and light it, and were to wait. In a few moments, by the light of that

solitary candle, we should all be able to see everything characteristic in the building. We should see all the other faces, for a human face is quick to catch light; and we should see the shape and the principal architectural features of the place. Of course, we should not see everything *clearly*; but what we did see by the candle, by daylight we should see only more clearly. What we see in ourselves in lucid and candid moments God sees with perfect clearness.

And so I say, and the Psalmist is my guide, that it is an extremely good thing to go away by ourselves after one of these crises. We had all indeed better meet our crisis on our knees; but, after we have met and triumphed over it, we would do well to put the enemy to rout by having a walk and a talk with ourselves alone. This good man (for a man is a good man who has become aware even of the good fight)—this good man said—and here I am not really going from the actual text—'You are a fine fellow; and that was a nice view of life you were philandering with! You made a great to-do about God not governing this world; when the fact is all that had really happened to you was that you were envious of unscrupulous people who seem to prosper.' As he laid the lash on himself stroke after stroke, he cried, 'O Lord, it is all true. O Lord, I was as a beast before Thee.' Now he meant that; he chose just that word *beast*, and we ought not to quarrel with it on grounds of taste, for he knew his own business. He had indeed envied cattle their stoutness and their placidity; forgetting for the moment that you cannot have it every way; that a cow has no sense of the landscape, no understanding of poetry; that Wordsworth will always be lost on a cow. 'So foolish was I, and ignorant: I was as a beast before Thee.'

He closes with a fine saying: 'Nevertheless I am continually with Thee.' Surely the translation should rather be: 'Nevertheless I am with Thee henceforth and to the end.' That is to say—Lord, never again shall I be tempted to speak with laughter and cynicism about this great life of ours. Thou mayst catch me yet in many a sorry byway of the spirit; but never henceforth in that particular corner.

. . . . . .

There are two ways of living, two ways of viewing life. There is the laughing, cynical, atheistic, unbelieving way; and there is the big way. There are two ways of playing the game. There is the big way and there is the rotten way. You and I are again and again inclined to think in a poor way about life. We have often very good reason. I do not want to speak easily about life; for life is such a baffling thing that God had to send His own Son into the world to encourage us to hold on. Faith is the substantiation of things hoped for; it is a conviction concerning things not seen. Faith is obedience to the highest possible hypothesis about life—that the best is the truth. Of course faith will always be confronted with an apparently contradicting world. I say of course: for otherwise, deprived, that is to say, of difficulties and obstacles and the haunting menace of its own alternative, faith would die out of the soul.

What then? Shall we whine? Shall we curse? Or—shall we pray?

Meanwhile, the silent lip!
Meanwhile, the climbing feet!

Recent Foreign Theology.

Arabia in the Bible.[1]

The notices of Arabia which occur in the Old Testament have been investigated by numerous savants, among whom the most famous are probably Sprenger and Glaser. Though the work of Dr. Moritz does not mention the Bible in its title, the second half is devoted to a study of Solomon's expedition to Ophir, while the first half, though not exclusively Biblical, contains many suggestions for the interpretation or illustration of Biblical texts. The author is one of the few scholars who have travelled in Arabia, and indeed with the camera, which has enabled him to present his readers with a number of successful photographs. But he also brings to bear on his subject profound acquaintance with the literature of the Arabs, which is indeed removed by many centuries from

[1] Von B. Moritz, *Arabien: Studien zur physikalischen und historischen Geographie des Landes* (Hanover, 1923).

the latest of the Biblical books, but owing to the general stability of Arabian institutions can here and there be utilized for the understanding of Biblical times.

This stability is only relative, and comparison between the references in the Old Testament, the later poetry, and the present time, exhibits changes even in the natural features of the country. The lion, about whom the classical poetry knows so much, and for whom it has so many names, is not now found in the peninsula. More surprising still is the general disappearance of the *tree*; in Is 21^{13} the caravans of Dedan (identified by Janssen and Savignac with al-'Ula) are threatened with nights to be spent in the forest, among the wild beasts; there are now no forests where they could lodge! Accumulations of sand have left old ports far inland. Such is probably the case with Ezion Geber, felicitously interpreted by Dr. Moritz as *The Ghaḍā bushes of Geber*, the name of their whilom owner.

This was the port whence Solomon and his ally Hiram sent ships to the Eldorado Ophir, whence they brought four hundred and twenty *kikkar* of gold. Since it would appear from the earliest account that the kings sent one ship apiece, the question arises how they procured this quantity of the precious metal. Two ships were scarcely sufficient for a warlike expedition; if, on the other hand, they were engaged in peaceful trade, what goods could they carry for which such a sum could be given in exchange? For the products of Palestine, being all agricultural, would scarcely provide in the cargo of two ships sufficient for such a price. Dr. Moritz's suggestion, that the cargo carried was one of slaves, seems to answer this question very imperfectly. He himself emphasizes the small dimensions of the craft employed; and a cargo of slaves, if carried for any considerable distance, would require extra provision of food and water, such as inanimate goods would not require; and if very high prices were to be demanded for the slaves, their accommodation in the vessels would have to be such as would make it likely that they would survive the voyage. If, on the other hand, the amount of gold brought back is enormously exaggerated, it is difficult to see why any record of such an expedition should be preserved. Yet neither war nor trade seems to account for the procuring of an enormous quantity with two boats of a few tons' burden. And indeed the narrative says nothing of either; it seems to think of Ophir as a place where gold was to be had in any quantity, like Sindbad's Valley of Precious Stones.

It remains to locate Ophir; and Dr. Moritz thinks the place intended must be somewhere on the Arabian coast; among other reasons he urges the difficulty which these craft would have encountered in negotiating the Bab al-Mandeb. On the other hand, whereas the Biblical narrative allows three years for the voyage, Dr. Moritz would reduce it to six months. Ophir has to be located in his opinion in some gold-bearing region probably belonging to the ancient kingdom of Saba.

It is, of course, the case that Ophir is mentioned in the genealogical table (Gn 10^{29}) as a son of Joktan, whose family are located in Arabia. Some names in that list can be identified either certainly or probably with Arabian localities. Ophir, however, cannot be; and the possibility must be considered that Ophir may have been regarded as the brother of Havilah, which seems capable of being identified in Arabia, on the ground of the connexion of both with gold.

If what the expedition did was neither to raid nor to trade, but to collect gold by working, then the length of time taken and the quantity obtained justify each other; and it is possible that the Biblical historian meant by Ophir no more than 'the gold country.' One can even imagine reasons why the whereabouts of such a place should be kept secret.

Dr. Moritz's work will be very generally welcomed for the fresh light which it brings to bear on the historical geography of Arabia and the Biblical allusions to that country.

D. S. Margoliouth.

Religious Experience and the New Psychology.[1]

By the Reverend F. J. Rae, M.A., Director of Religious Instruction, Aberdeen.

The Christian religion has passed through several critical tests in the last hundred years. New sciences have appeared which taught the world to do without God. Physical science, in the flush of its great triumphs, explained the processes of nature without the need of Divine intervention. Then came the science of Criticism which in its turn traced the course and development of the Biblical literature, proving conclusively that there was no necessity for any Divine Author to account for the facts. Finally, the science of Comparative Religion, discovering that man has everywhere and always been religious, proclaimed that religion is a natural product, and that no one religion is any truer than another, thus disposing of Revelation. The menace to religious faith of these sciences has, however, now largely faded away. Natural science and religion are very good friends. Criticism has rendered to living faith a really great service. And even Comparative Religion has furnished a new weapon to Apologetics in the discovery that man is incurably religious.

To-day there is a fresh menace, but it is the same old 'enemy.' Science, Criticism, and Comparative Religion attempted to show that God was not a reality by simply explaining the processes by which things happened. And it is a somewhat significant fact that the newest science, that of Psychology in its latest development, employs the same argument. It explains the process of religious experience and thereby (according to some of its most influential exponents) explains away its reality. But what is the 'New Psychology'? And why is it the 'New' that is a menace? The difference between the New and the Old Psychology is very simple. Orthodox Psychology dealt with the conscious mind and its processes. Reason and will had a large and important place in its account of mental life. The New Psychology reverses all this. The conscious region is a very small part of the mind. The really important, and by far the largest, region of the mind is the unconscious. There are to be found the instincts that are the real factors in mental life. Round them the whole life of the mind is organized. By them it is shaped. Our beliefs, our morality, our choices, our conduct are determined by these forces in the unconscious. All the memories of the past are there, all the influences of heredity, all the real energy of mind, the emotions and interests and desires and tendencies that form character and inspire action. It is in many respects a terrible region, this unconscious. According to men like Freud it is little less than disgusting. Even the best of the New Psychologists shake their heads over it. Of course it has its good elements. But the thing to realize is that it is the decisive formative influence that *does* things and shapes things. We imagine we are reasonable beings, but we are not. Reason plays a very menial part in life. Its chief business is to find arguments to justify our instinctive actions. We do not act reasonably; we act instinctively. There are notable instances of this, as, *e.g.*, the formation of morality; but there are numberless commonplace examples of the same thing. Instinct decides for us, and then we proceed to 'rationalize' this act, giving fine names to it and finding a really respectable source for it. The putative parentage of our acts and beliefs is, however, very different from the real parentage.

The most striking example of this is religion. Not all the New Psychologists are unbelievers, of course, any more than all scientists were atheists or all critics sceptics. There are many who are devout believers. But the tendency of the New Science in the flush of its new vision is towards a subjectivism which makes religious experience simply a product of the mind. There are different ways of putting this. Religion is sometimes represented to be the projection outside ourselves of an ideal in the form of God in order to bring life and nature into harmony. To this desire for unity we owe the formation of philosophical systems, and also the idea of a moral order of the universe. The mind feels an imperious necessity for harmony

[1] A. G. Tansley, *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life*; W. S. Swisher, *Religion and the New Psychology: A Psycho-Analytic Study of Religion*; Oscar Pfister, *Some Applications of Psycho-Analysis*; R. H. Thouless, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*; Ruth Rouse and H. Crichton Miller, *Christian Experience and Psychological Processes*; F. R. Barry, *Christianity and Psychology*.

within itself. Hence its projection of a religious creed. Another way of accounting for religious belief is to say that it is the embodiment of our need of consolation, or, again, of the qualities necessary to the herd. 'God always stands for what is felt to be in the interests of humanity.' It is the usefulness of 'God' to us that determines our belief in Him. The mind throws up a rope into the heavens, in the manner of the Indian juggler, and then climbs up the rope. 'At this stage of development consciousness is perpetually deceiving itself about the contents and working of the mind, perpetually constructing false harmonies which break down at the test of experience. The most permanently successful of these protective devices are those which project the ideal unification of the mind into a supernatural sphere where it is safe from direct attack, and can be guarded and treasured for the guidance and consolation of those who can find no guidance or consolation in the natural world. This safeguarding of the ideal, eventually hedged about with all the authority of a great herd organization—the Church—has indeed resulted in the relative permanence of a high standard of life and conduct which has been of incalculable benefit to mankind. But the results of even this great and sustained effort at unification fail to resist the assaults of rational scepticism and the slow sapping effect of increasing objective knowledge.' These sentences are quoted from Tansley because he is the sanest of those who occupy this standpoint. Freud's sex obsession is not shared by many other psychologists, and the efforts of followers of his, like Swisher, are more amusing than disturbing. According to Swisher, Paul was a neurotic suffering from a violently repressed love-life. His trouble was the Œdipus complex. This was his thorn in the flesh. Job also suffered from a heavy neurosis, though happily in his case he was psycho-analysed and got relief. It was otherwise with 'Ecclesiastes.' He unhappily was an unharmonized neurotic suffering from a violent repression, in short from the Œdipus complex again. Modesty forbids me explaining what an Œdipus complex is, but it seems to have been very catching among Biblical writers.

One thing may indeed be reckoned to the New Psychology for righteousness. It has made a contribution to apologetics of a valuable kind. Its reduction of the importance of the purely rational function of the mind, however exaggerated, contains a valuable truth. The emphasis on instinct and emotion and on their place in life is simply an echo of the teaching of Scripture as to the way in which we know God. Roughly speaking, the 'Unconscious' is what the Bible means by 'the heart'; and of this Jesus says: 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God,' while Paul says: 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' In other words, all through the Bible it is experience that is the avenue to the knowledge of God and to certainty about Him. We do not reach God by arguing about Him. We do not obtain faith by the way of reason. And one of the things the New Psychology has done is to strike a blow at that cold rationalism which is as impotent as it is uninspiring. The prominence given to the practical elements in the life of the mind helps us to understand and value the religious life and assurance of simple people in whom the rational side has not been developed, but who know through the discipline of life Him in whom they have believed.

1. What have we to say, however, in reply to the presentation of religious experience as a purely subjective product of the mind, created at the instance of our desires and interests or by suggestion from others, a projection of our ideal self into the infinite, a rationalization of our desire for comfort and peace? Two things may be said to begin with. One is that in this contention psychology goes entirely out of its own province and beyond its own powers. Physical science made the same error fifty years ago. The business of science is to collect and arrange facts and laws. Their significance is the business of philosophy. The business of psychology as a science is to describe the working of the mind. It has no right whatever to go beyond this and interpret the facts in their ultimate meaning. That is the work of philosophy. In the strict sense the theory of religious faith as a projection or rationalization is an impertinence. The question of the source and working of states of mind is one thing. The question of the reality and validity of the objects to which these states point is quite another thing. It is a very common fallacy to judge the worth of a process by its origin instead of by its goal, and the theory under consideration is of this nature. Of course the psychologist may not go so far in words as to theorize about origins. He may content himself with analysing the process by which he believes religious belief to have been developed and then simply shrug his

shoulders. 'Metaphysics is not my business,' he says, 'but that is how faith arises, and the conclusion is obvious.' But in point of fact the conclusion he points to is anything but obvious. The question of objective validity has not been touched. It should be recognized clearly that all psychology can possibly assert is that psychological analysis by itself cannot prove the real existence of the objects of faith. That is the obvious conclusion, and it is a perfectly sound one. Physical science cannot prove the existence of God, but the facts which it has gathered and the laws it has discovered may by a process outside the field of science be conducted to a perfectly reasonable conclusion as to the existence and the operation of a Divine creative working behind these facts and laws. Pratt uses the following illustration of this point. He imagines that the human race is living in sunlight but that most men are blind and only a few are able to see. One of the blind psychologists could prove conclusively that the opening of the eyes in the case of those who saw was the cause of the light sensations, and fully explained them, no reference being needed to the sun or any outer source. Not a single element in the experience of seeing the sun would be unexplained by the psychological analysis. And from the psychological point of view the blind psychologist would be perfectly right. But the question of the reality of the sun would be unaffected by the analysis. The application to the theory of projection is obvious. But the same thing may be said of the theory that religious experience is due to suggestion. This may be true in many cases, but the fact does not in any way touch the question of the reality to which the experience points. Suggestion is used to implant true ideas in the mind as well as false ideas, and the question whether the ideas are true or false is not decided by the fact of suggestion. As Thouless points out, the fact of suggestion is completely irrelevant to the question of the truth or validity of belief. The conclusion, then, to which we are led so far is that nothing psychology has discovered is decisive as to the reality of the objects of religious faith. This is to be decided in other ways and by other criteria. As soon as this limitation is recognized the negative suggestion of such terms as 'projection,' 'rationalization' and 'idealization' loses its force.

2. The second consideration referred to is that the argument against the validity of religious experience contained in the analysis of the New Psychology would abolish *all* reality in an objective sense. What is said of religious experience must be said of other kinds of experience. If God is a projection of the mind, so, in the same sense and on the same grounds, is external nature. The unity which the mind finds in the external world would thus be a rationalization of experience to bring to the mind that harmony which it desires. It is a projection of the need of the mind into the 'outer' world. This is frankly asserted to be the case in regard to morality. There is no objective standard of ethics. There is no 'absolute' morality. Moral law is the creation of the herd instinct which imposes on the individual conduct which is useful, and even necessary, for the cohesion, and indeed the very existence, of the herd. But this has no authority other than the force which the herd can exert. The only final moral authority is the individual mind which in the last resort can and ought to recognize no authority but its 'ethical self.'

But all this is equally true of an external world. If we are to follow the suggestion of the New Psychology, the idealist interpretation of mental experience is absolutely impregnable. There seems no more reason for believing in the objective reality of the sensible facts of perception than there is for believing in the supersensible facts of religious life. What we do in the first case is to project a world of 'objects' outside ourselves, and we do so because we want a sense of stability in our experience. If you reply that all men see an outside world and believe themselves to be in contact with objective reality, that would not be convincing to the New Psychologist. The same consideration would prove the objective character of religious experience because religion is universal also. And the answer in both cases is identical, viz., that the mind is the same everywhere and acts in the same way. Men are everywhere and always religious because they have the same needs and the same minds and the same instincts. But this applies also to the objects of perception in the world around. We all 'see' an external world because our minds are alike and our needs alike.

It is obvious enough that the conclusion of such an argument is total scepticism as to all reality. And this seems to be implicitly confessed by a writer like Tansley in his definition of truth. He says that God is a necessity to the human race, and will long continue to be so. 'If this be so, we

cannot deny the "truth" of the substance of religion, though we may criticise many of its forms. All universal and self-consistent expressions of the activity of the human spirit have a claim to the name of "truth." It is clear, of course, that religious truth is incommensurate with scientific truth, just as for instance mathematical truth is incommensurate with artistic truth' (p. 161). The point to be stressed here is the definition of 'truth' as the universal and self-consistent expression of the human spirit. That is a good description of the psychological standpoint, but if it is taken as a complete definition of truth it excludes all objective reality, and in consistency with this we should regard as the creation of the mind not only religious experiences and philosophical systems and morality, but the belief in a concrete basis of perception. When we have led the psychologist gently forward on his own path to the goal of a complete scepticism, we may leave him there to recover his breath. It may be added, however, that the 'given' nature of religious experience, especially when it is unexpected and cuts across habit and instinct (as it often does), has the same character of objective reality as the facts and events of the external world which impress themselves on the mind as new objects of perception.

3. Turning from these preliminary considerations, however, let us see what is to be said of a positive kind on the problem before us. A fact of a helpful nature is obvious—the support in this matter which is offered by Reason and Instinct to one another. One serious defect of the New Psychology is its attitude to reason. Reason plays a very subordinate rôle in the web of experience. It is very much the servant of the Unconscious. It is always at the disposal of the great instincts, to give their choice an air of decency and equity. This is a theory which will not bear examination. We are indebted to the New Psychology for much, and a great deal it says of our instinctive life is not only true but helpful. It appears to me, however, that the part played by the Unconscious in life is seriously exaggerated, and that the rôle of the conscious and especially of the self-conscious reason is seriously underestimated. Is it a true account of human beings to say that they are the creatures of instinct, that their 'will' is only a kind of 'urge' in a certain direction under the impulse of emotion, and that the conscious mind does little more than register decisions taken for them by the unconscious self? The whole history of man seems to me to show that this is largely untrue, and it will be found to be one of the positions of the new science of mind which cannot be maintained. Reason has played a great part in the mental life of man and plays a great part to-day. It is not the chief instrument of religious experience. It is not the way by which faith is reached. But it is a final court of appeal for all the constructions of the human spirit. We cannot continue to believe what it condemns. We cannot continue to practise what it rejects. It has a power of serene judgment and a power of large vision which both play their part in the building up of religious beliefs. It would not be much of an exaggeration to say that reason is that which makes man what he is. It is not the servant but the master in the house of life. And it is in virtue of the exercise of his reason in the long history of his mind that man has achieved his greatest triumphs and vindicated his place as the greatest of the works of God.

If this be a true account of man then reason plays a far greater part in mental life than the New Psychology allows; and its independent deliverance supports the witness of religious experience. Reason, looking out on the world, perceives everywhere an order in nature; and, looking out on history, discovers an increasing purpose in the progressive life of man. But these facts point to an Author of Nature who is intelligent and a Presence in the life of man that guides the ship of life to its haven. But this is just what religious experience everywhere and always witnesses. And the congruence of these two instruments of truth, the reason and the 'heart,' self-conscious mind that looks before and after, and the experience of life that finds God in its own deepest and truest moments, is one of the things that points steadily to the objective worth and validity of religious experience. 'If,' writes Thouless on the last page of his interesting book, 'we find that by following the dictates of religious experience, we build up a system which, on the whole, corresponds with the religious system built up from consideration of the other types of relevant experience—*i.e.* the facts of the natural world, the historical facts of religions, and the facts of the moral consciousness; then we have a very impressive argument for the general validity of religious experience.'

4. In his remarkably able and suggestive volume on *Christianity and Psychology*, Mr. F. R. Barry

works out another line of argument. Stated generally, his contention is that the facts with which psychology is occupied as well as the methods of psycho-therapy really *presuppose*, as their own postulate, the Christian interpretation of the Universe, and will only 'work' if that is assumed to be true. The line of argument is as follows. Psychology speaks a great deal of personality, of unifying it and harmonizing it, and so on. But by what right does psychology speak of 'personality' or 'self' at all? Which of our many 'selves' is the personality? It assumes we have an ideal of personality before us. But that is what, from psychology alone, we do not have. We have only a chaos of 'complexes' and impulses, fragmentary, competing for expression. On the ground of psychology we have no hope of integrating these into a personality. Psychology therefore must start with an *a priori* judgment about the existence and meaning of Personality. But this drives you back to the conclusion that for an unlimited number of different selves there must be a Perfect Personality, because the conflicts and discords of the individual subject can be reconciled only in a single and unified personal life. It is impossible to say that there is an ideal life for each unless there is an ideal life for all. Thus there must be, in the nature of Reality, some fixed ideal and goal of personal life before you can have any warrant for assuming that there is an ideal life for the individual. But an ideal of personality cannot be other than personal itself. And if it is an ideal for all persons, it cannot be one person among others; it must be a perfect all-including life from which all other persons derive their meaning. We must therefore start with the recognition of God as the pre-condition of perfected human life. 'Without the fundamental assumption . . . of personality at the back of things, there is no possibility of constructive thinking. . . . On no other terms will psychology make sense.'

This seems to me an impressive argument. It is, in another form, the fact which I have already suggested, that you have to go outside psychology if you are to 'make sense' not only of experience, but of psychology itself. The same argument is derived from the New Psychology in its practical form as psycho-analysis. The aim of psycho-therapy is to restore the personality to what it ought to be. But how do we know what it ought to be? Where is the standard to which it is to conform? Education, *e.g.*, is the development of personality. But a teacher must have in his mind an ideal of personality to which he is to bring his pupils. He will not simply seek to make them develop according to their own tendencies, which may be all wrong. Where is the standard of personality to which we are to conform the individual? Here, again, you need an ideal personality, and the faith of the Christian supplies, and alone fully supplies, the need.

5. In any attempt to reproduce the state of the argument on this great subject at the present time (which is all I am attempting to do in this article) the suggestion made by Thouless in his concluding chapter must not be omitted. Thouless is painfully cautious in his statements, and before he puts down his foot anywhere he tests the ground carefully to see if it will bear his weight. This gives his judgment greater influence, though perhaps he is too suspicious of the solidity of the ground that tempts him forward. What he is seeking is a criterion to establish the validity of religious experience, and, after pressing his foot in one direction and another and drawing it back from them all, he finally makes a definite advance. And the ground he occupies is this. The power of a religious doctrine to rationalize (that is, to give a coherent, intelligible, and reasonably simple account of) experience is a criterion (however imperfect) of its truth. This is not to say that the truth of a doctrine is its power to rationalize experience, but that 'a doctrine rationalizes experience because it has, certainly in a limited and relative way, that relation to an objective reality which we call *truth*.' Thouless points out that this is the criterion used to test the truth of a scientific theory. A scientific theory is true because it gives a coherent and intelligible account of all the available facts. And this criterion he extends to the religious sphere. Its limitations are carefully indicated by Thouless. The probability of error, however, is small if the experiences used cover a wide range and if the explanation is the same in all. 'The fact that the belief in God rationalizes, let us say, our experience of the moral conflict, will be one piece of evidence in favour of the view that the belief in God is a true one. If we find that this same belief also rationalizes the facts of religious experience the evidence is proportionately strengthened, and so on for all the experience we can investigate which is relevant to the belief in question.' A more general way of

putting Thouless's argument is to say that religious truth roots the great values of life, truth, beauty and goodness, in reality, and that unless this is valid the universe is a chaos. Very likely this way of putting the matter would make Thouless draw his foot back again in alarm. But if it is more general or more philosophical (in the narrow sense) it is none the less true. If I am asked to live for goodness, truth, or beauty, I want to know if these things are big enough to claim my loyalty, that is to say, real enough. And this means: Are they rooted in the ultimate truth of things? It is quite true the mind *does* crave for harmony in the universe. But it is infinitely more likely that this is because the universe is meant to satisfy this deep instinct than that the unity of things is a mere figment of the rationalizing tendency of the mind.

There is something infinitely pathetic in the New Psychology when it comes face to face with the question: What are you going to offer to humanity in place of the religious truth which is a pure creation of the mind without any 'objective' reality? What is the hope of the world? The only things our new science can offer are an extension of the herd instinct until it becomes as wide as humanity, and a development of the tender feeling which is rooted in human nature. This is a melancholy prospect. For there is absolutely no reason whatever to suppose the herd instinct will spread and become more general. Experience is all the other way. It separates men into groups which fight each other and hate each other. The herd instinct creates employers and employed, German and French, conservatives and radicals. It shows no tendency to produce a brotherhood of humanity, because there is nothing in it to produce such a great fellowship. That is a pure creation of religion, and is possible only when God is believed in as the Universal Father.

As to the growth of a tender feeling in human beings, there is no ground at all for believing this to be in any but a limited and sectional way characteristic of human nature. It is found in the family, but it is notorious that family feeling may exist with the most intense selfishness and exclusiveness, and we have no reason to think that the tenderness within the family will spread so as to include those who are strangers, but rather the opposite. The spiritual bankruptcy which these reflexions point to in the New Psychology is no proof of the truth of religious experience. But at any rate such a consideration will make us look carefully at the credentials of a system which (so far as religious truth is concerned) may be purely destructive, and can offer nothing to take the place of what, after all, has been the foster-nurse of all that has been great in the life of man.

In the Study.

A Prayer.

Merciful God, Thou kind and loving Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast created us, that in Jesus Christ Thou hast redeemed us, and that by Thy Holy Spirit Thou hast called us into Thy fellowship and service. We thank Thee with all our heart for the kindness which Thou hast bestowed upon us during the time that is past. Thou hast protected us from danger to body and soul; Thou hast enriched us with blessings beyond our knowledge; and with much patience Thou hast borne with our faults.

We are not worthy of all the mercy which Thou hast shown to us, and we pray with hearty repentance for pardon of any evil we have done, and of our constant misuse of Thy grace. Enter not into judgment with Thy servants, but let Thy compassion in Jesus Christ wash us from all our guilt.

O Thou who art the Keeper of Israel, Thou who neither slumberest nor sleepest, be Thou the Guardian of our lives. We commend to Thy gracious care our bodies and our spirits, our possessions and our powers, our waking and sleeping, our life and death. Cover us with Thy hand, and keep us from all evil and from every fear. O Lord, our hope is in Thee; let Thy love be our shield, and guard us unto life eternal, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Passing.[1]

'Ready to distribute.'—1 Ti 6^{18}.

That means sharing things, passing on our good things, playing the game together and not each for his own hand.

I heard a missionary speaker once tell of the most remarkable football team he had ever seen. It was at Beyrout, I think, and was organized by a young Scottish missionary. The centre forward was an Armenian, the forwards on either wing were Turks. There were a couple of Jews, a negro, a Copt, and a few other odds and ends; a mixture like the Tower of Babel, of nations that usually hated each other and did each other all the harm they could. Yet they were all playing in one football team, brought together by the power of Jesus.

The missionary said he was told that the most difficult thing to teach these men was to pass to each other. Every one was keen to dart down the field and score the goal himself; and when their teacher had got a man to understand that he must play, not for himself, but for the team, when he had taught him to pass, he knew he had done a great thing not only for the team, but for that man's own life.

Now that is just what St. Paul means when he says Christians must be 'ready to distribute.' They must learn to pass.

Our world in Europe is to-day in a terrible mess because every nation is playing its own game. They are fixed on their own plans. They want to mend the trouble in their own way. They want to score the goals and gather the glory single-handed. This won't do in football and it won't do in the big game of life; and things will never be right until each nation forgets itself and denies itself, and all pull together for the good of all.

In our own nation we see the same thing. We were one nation in the War, pulling together like one team, all ready to give up something of our own for the sake of the nation. That is how we got on and won the War.

Now we are all at sixes and sevens. Miners, engineers, employers, workmen, each determined on his own score, and nobody scoring at all for that very reason. It isn't a team when every player is playing on his own and won't pass to the next man, and we aren't a nation to-day. We are just a lot of jostling people, not playing the game, not 'ready to distribute.'

This is the secret of life for every one of us. The great lesson is to learn to pass. If you have comfort, it isn't yours only. Pass it on. There are others who are being starved on the wing because you don't pass to them. They lose heart and interest and fall out of the game discouraged. Pass on your comfort, your friendship, your money, pass out and play the game for the team. This is the spirit of our Master. It is what He did; and being a Christian means just this, being 'ready to distribute.'

Look farther than our own nation. We have good news to give, the news of the love of God that Jesus Christ brought. That isn't our own for ourselves only. There are thousands in the world who know nothing about it. It's for them too. We have got to pass it on. That is what we call Foreign Missions. I call it just playing the game. These heathen people are being starved of what they have a right to and a great need of, because so many Christians at home say they don't believe in Foreign Missions, or, while they say they believe, give so little and show so little interest that it is plain they don't really believe at all.

God wants us all to be one, playing like a team for His kingdom, all the nations together for God, all the people in each nation together for God, all for each and each for all. We are fond of the words 'my' and 'mine,' but when Jesus taught us to pray He left these words out, and told us to say 'our'—*Our* Father, *our* daily bread, *our* sins, *our* temptations. 'Ready to distribute,' says St. Paul, 'bear one another's burdens,' 'share in all good things,' 'members of each other,' playing the game together under our Captain, Christ.

If we come to Him, the first lesson He will teach us, the hardest to learn, the most worth learning for it is the key to a happy life, will be to learn to pass.

[1] By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

Smudges.[2]

'Saved; yet so as by fire.'—1 Co 3^{15}.

Have you ever noticed, what one can see now and then, a black smudge on the skin of an orange, sometimes faint and sometimes darker, that you can wipe away, or that comes off upon your fingers? And do you know how it comes there? A friend of mine, who has a great fruit farm at the other side

[2] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

of the world, once told me about it. It's like this. They have a beautiful climate yonder, sunny and bright and hot, but once in a while, just when the oranges are beginning to ripen, there comes a touch of frost at night. And that would mean the ruin of the whole crop for the year. So they have to guard against it somehow, and what they do is this. Whenever the evening sets in cold, and they think frost is coming, they put long rows of twinkling little oil lamps, one under each orange bush, and that keeps the air warm enough to save the fruit. But, as you who live in the country know, oil lamps can be dreadfully smoky (can't they ?), and that's where the smudge came from. It is quite a good orange, it may be sweet enough, but it was almost lost. The frost came, and it was just saved. It was saved only by fire, and there's the mark on it still. And most of us have got marks and smudges like that upon us too. Not on our hands and faces ! Mother, of course, would never allow that ! Every time you are in a hurry and scamp your washing, though it looks all right to you, she always sees that there is something wrong, a tide mark left up on your forehead, or down on your neck. And she won't have soiled hands when you sit down at table.

No, but the marks on us are deeper in, are on our heart and mind and soul. Between you and me, you really are a fairly idle little rascal, aren't you ? Take that practising of yours ! How you try to wriggle out of it, and what scores of excuses you can make ! And even when you are at last pinned down to the piano with whole twenty minutes to go, you don't try much, now do you ? You twiddle at this, and give it up ; and take to something else, and rattle through it till you come to a hard bit. And, 'Bother, I can't do it, anyway time must be up.' And off you rush to the clock, and your face falls. 'Only ten minutes !' And back again, but by and by, well, it must be over now ; and off to the clock again. 'Only twelve minutes !' Why, it must have stopped ! No ! Well, at any rate it's a wee bit past the twelve, we'll call it thirteen. And you crawl once more to the piano, and your eyes light on the maker's name, and London. That sets you dreaming. 'I wish I were in London, to see the Tower, and the Zoo, and all the rest of it.' And then you waken up and off to the clock. Time's up, and that's finished ! Yet you haven't really practised, not one little bit. And by and by when you grow up one piece of you won't have grown up at all ! You'll be able to talk, that bit has grown all right ; and to walk, that bit has grown ; but not to play music, that bit of you will be still a baby that can't do anything. And all your life you will carry the ugly smudge of that stupid idleness of yours.

And there are other marks deeper in yet, away in on our souls. You can rub off the smudge on an orange, but these have to stand. For living life is like an examination where there is no rubbing out allowed. If you put down a silly thing, you can say later, that is all wrong, and do it better, but it all has to go in. Every time that you get huffy, or fly into a passion, remember that that makes a smoky mark upon your soul, and it doesn't come off. There is a man in the Bible called Mark, a splendid man, to whom we owe the Second Gospel and many another thing. But once when he was young he grew afraid of what they had to face, and left Paul, and went home. Afterwards he became very brave and daring, and feared nothing ; and we know that, and are proud of him. And yet that old smudge of cowardice hasn't come out ; and when people hear of him they think, 'Ah, that's the man who ran away.' Then there is Peter, Jesus' greatest friend, a glorious, lovable, brave man, yet once he faltered and failed through fear, that night when he was standing in the shadow where the leaping flames of the great fires in the courtyard wouldn't throw any light on his face and betray him to the soldiers, and a pert girl found him out, and when he had to speak, his accent gave him away, and he grew frightened and lied. And still, in spite of all the noble things he did before and after, when people hear of him they think, 'That is the man who denied Jesus, said he didn't know Him, failed his friend.' The smudge, even after all these years, has not rubbed off. Or even if people do forget about it and don't see it, the man himself knows and he sees it. Who remembers that Paul, the great Christian, was once Saul who harried and killed Christ's folk ? Ah ! but Paul always remembered. He hated that mark upon his soul, which blackened him and burned into him, and would not come off. He was saved, but the smoky smudge was there.

Keep yourselves clean. For temper and selfishness are not things that you can wipe off, and so an end of them : they are more like a hideous accident that leaves results that never pass. Suppose a stupid fellow, let us say a miner down in the workings underground where there is gas at times and it is dangerous and no light must ever be lit, took a

craving for a smoke, struck a match, and there came a dreadful explosion, his mates would hurry to his help, they always do, would say, 'Poor Bill has been doing something foolish, but foolish or no we must get him out.' And they would do it. But at best he would be all maimed and scarred and lame for life. He would be saved, but only as by fire. And all his days he would go sore and limping, and perhaps on crutches, all for that one minute's foolishness. So you take care, look at the orange and remember that our smudges don't come off, and so make up your minds that there is going to be no temper and no selfishness for you.

The Christian Year.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Free Gift of God.

'For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.'—Ro 6^{23}.

The New Testament doctrine of grace obviously depends upon its doctrine of sin. In the gospel of Jesus Christ the way of overcoming and destroying sin is revealed, but this way is valid and necessary only if the teaching of Jesus and His apostles concerning the nature of sin is essentially true.

There is in modern times a departure from the evangel of the Cross, and we find that the denial of the great message of atoning grace is partly produced by, and partly creative of, a fundamentally different conception of sin. Those who teach a more superficial method of human redemption naturally give a more superficial meaning to sin. In the evolution-gospel sin is only the 'necessary shadow of the good.' The entrance of so-called sin into the world, if it is to be called a fall at all, must be called a 'fall upwards.' We have a somewhat similar conception of sin in the 'natural divinity' theology—sin is but an accident, man is incapable of essential wrongdoing, for his nature is essentially divine. Sin does not touch the essence of human life. How little, then, can it be a cosmic disaster? And how little can it need the intervention of Divine self-sacrifice to avert the ruin? Of course a man may lie and thieve and murder and wallow in unmentionable wickedness; but the thing is not fundamentally serious. It is only a holy divinity falling into an error of judgment.

Let us pass from these follies to the gospel of the Son of God, which teaches that human sin is the essential and complete failure and disaster of the human spirit, so that nothing less than the Divine intervention in a specific work of redemption could save men from ruin.

1. *Sin is fundamentally fatal.*—'The wages of sin is death.'

The term 'wages' is here introduced in order to bring in the contrast of the next clause. As sin pays its servants the earned meed of death, so God gives men in Jesus Christ the free and unearned gift of eternal life. In the twenty-first verse the form of statement is different: 'For the end of those things is death.' The meaning clearly is, that sin is radical disaster. It inflicts death upon man's essential life. It is fundamentally fatal.

In man's deepest consciousness of sin, it is known to be essential antagonism to God. The Son of Man did not know it in Himself, but He knew it clearly and fully in others, and He declared its nature to be satanic, the essence of diabolical opposition to God and truth. Man may wrong his fellow-man, but it is in its opposition to the life of God that the act becomes sin. Hence the truly profound and awful consciousness of the penitential cry: 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight.'

Sin is continuously destructive of moral fibre. Sin can be seen eating away the moral substance and fibre of life as clearly as a ravaging disease can be seen eating away the tissue and strength of the physical constitution. In the light of this fact the philosophy of sin as a 'fall upwards,' and the representation of it as a blundering effort to find God, are alike convicted of foolishness and of a refusal to look the grave facts of life honestly in the face.

The end of such a process is evident: 'The end of those things is death.' It is impossible to expound in its fullness the meaning of this 'death.' The possible references and relations of this terrible word to man's future existence have raised many controversies. Over some of these relations a dark cloud hangs, and eschatology gleams darkly from behind the veiling of God. Yet we can see and know enough to make sin appear exceedingly terrible. For this 'death', compared with physical death, is as the soul compared with the body. It is death preying on man's deepest nature, on his eternal being.

2. *God overcomes the fatal power of sin* by the free gift of eternal life.

Since sin reigns in man, and sin is the power of death, the God of redemption comes to man with the free gift of corresponding life. This cannot come as wages or as reward, for it is the first step in the overcoming of sin, and this step must be taken by the grace of God. The message of the grace of God makes appeal to that element in man which has got at the seat of power in the natural man, and is working out its ravages, little by little overcoming the natural tendencies towards good. Man can be saved from himself only by accepting the gift of all-conquering spiritual life from God.

But what is this eternal life? It is important to notice that it is not the negation of death, not, as it has often been regarded, something stored away for us in the heavens. It is a positive power by which a man is recreated, the vital incoming of new spiritual life into the human spirit. No doubt the reference of the glorious words, 'eternal life,' passes onwards into unknown meanings and developments of glory in the everlasting prospect of the saints of God; but those unimaginable glories depend upon the vital meaning which eternal life has for us here and now. Life is not an arrangement, but a power. The life eternal is not something to be received in another world, but the spiritual might which is to conquer our sin at the present time. For the spiritual and the eternal are one. The life which is given in the atonement of the Son of God is the entrance of the life of the God of redemption to take supreme command of our being. 'This is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.'

God's gift of life is the beginning of new power, and therefore a call to noblest effort. Although eternal life can come only as God's free gift, yet, having come, it introduces a test of service in which the prospect of a final reward is not absent. The life itself cannot be other than a free gift, but the working out of that life into its final form of glory depends in no small measure upon our faithfulness. The warning comes to the negligent disciple, 'Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.' Happy the man who can say at last, 'I laboured more abundantly than they all. Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.'[1]

[1] J. Thomas, *The Mysteries of Grace*, 144.

Eighth Sunday after Trinity.

Modern Prophets.

'And Moses said unto him, Art thou jealous for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!'—Nu 11[29].

We read a great deal in the Old Testament about priests and prophets. They were the two leading officials in Old Testament times. The priests carried the needs of the people up to God. The prophets carried God's message down to the people. We often think of the prophets as if they were simply foretellers of the future, but as a matter of fact that was not their principal function. Their principal duty was to make known the will of God to the people. They received the message from God in various ways: sometimes in a dream, sometimes in a waking vision, sometimes through thoughts arising in their own hearts. But they knew that it was a message from God however it came, and they delivered it to the people with the authoritative words, 'Thus saith the Lord.'

Now, when Christ rose from the dead the priest and the prophet as separate officials came to an end. When the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, every worshipper had direct access to God. He had just as much right to enter the Holy of Holies as the priest had. And when the day of Pentecost arrived, and the Holy Spirit sat like a tongue of fire upon the head of every person gathered in the Upper Room, all received the gift of prophecy. From that time every follower of Christ is a priest, and every follower of Christ is a prophet. On that day there was fulfilled the wish of Moses, which is contained in our text, when he said, 'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets.'

We are all prophets now! All the Lord's people are. That means, then, that every one of us has to receive God's message and to tell it.

1. *We have to receive God's message.* In other words, we have to learn God's will. How are we to do that? The prophets of Old Testament times received it in dreams and visions. But that is not the way He speaks to us to-day. Of course, it may be that occasionally God declares His will to us in some such abnormal way as that, but it is certainly only in very rare cases—much rarer, perhaps, than we are apt to think.

The Jews asked for signs and wonders. 'Now

when Herod saw Jesus he was exceeding glad, for he hoped to see a sign.' It was a restless curiosity, itching for the sensation of some novel entertainment; it was not the desire of a faint and weary heart hungering for bread. And Jesus answered him nothing. An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign. They seek to get evidence of the future life through merely human agencies and physical sensations, when such evidence is to be obtained only by the trusting, loving heart. They want a loud voice from the other world to tell them what lies beyond the veil, and it is not surprising that there comes back to their ears only a foolish echo of their own voice.

> And not for signs in heaven above
> Or earth below they look,
> Who know with John His smile of love,
> With Peter His rebuke.
>
> In joy of inward peace, or sense
> Of sorrow over sin,
> He is His own best evidence,
> His witness is within.

In order to know the will of God there are two essential things.

The first is *faith in God*; that is to say, we believe that God is righteous; anything like injustice, or cruelty, or contempt—anything of that kind is abomination to Him. The will of God is declared to us by rousing within us an abhorrence of these things, and a determination that as far as in us lies we will help to put an end to them. Examples readily occur. A man who is cruel to children or to dumb animals is not a prophet of God; he has not learned God's will. No more is a man who seeks to enslave other men—whatever form the slavery takes; it may be compelling them to work for unreasonable wages, or it may be enticing them to some vice.

The second thing is that we must have *hope for men*. We must believe in God first of all, and then we must believe in men. One of the most striking sentences in all the Bible is a sentence consisting of three words in the First Epistle of Peter, 'Honour all men.' It expresses the difference between Christianity and other religions. Could a Jew do that? How he hated the Samaritan! Could a Hindu do that? How he despises the outcasts! But do we do it? Edna Lyall, whose stories are perhaps not much read to-day, describes one of her characters in this way. Carlo had the rare and enviable gift of seeing people as they might have been under happier circumstances, and the still rarer gift of treating them as such. The life of Christ was full of this kind of hopefulness for men. So hope for men is also essential if we are to be prophets. If we believe in God and believe in men, we shall certainly know God's will.

2. When we have learned God's will, then *we have to deliver it*. The prophet would not have been a true prophet if he had kept it to himself. Do we shrink from making God's will known to others? The prophet often shrinks from the duty of delivering his message. Jeremiah pleaded that he was an inexperienced man. 'I am a child,' he said. Jonah ran away. When he was told to go to Nineveh he took ship in the opposite direction to Tarshish. And yet no one knew the will of God better than Jonah. 'I know that thou art a gracious God,' he said, 'full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy.' Surely that was a knowledge that no man could keep to himself, and yet Jonah felt he would rather go anywhere than to Nineveh to declare God's will. He would rather die than do it. You remember his words: 'O Lord, take, I beseech thee, my life from me; for it is better for me to die than to live.' Of course we are not all sent to preach, as Jonah was. But if we are not sent to preach we are at least sent to talk. We can surely imitate that poor woman of Samaria, who went home and told her neighbours what Christ had said to her. It is a strange thing, when you come to think of it, that people who are bent upon attaining the same end in life—truth, goodness, and purity—should never give the slightest indication to each other in words that this is so; never allude in the presence of their best and dearest friends to that which is their chief hope and highest interest. We are all called to be prophets—not one here or there. We are all in the pulpit, for that matter. For Christ has broken down the professional barriers between priest and people. The worshippers are no longer expected to stand outside in the temple courts; they can pass into the Most Holy Place itself.

But religious conversation must, above all, be real; there must be no humbug about it—no hypocrisy, exaggeration, unreality. And there are some things in religion that are not for common talk, which a delicate, sensitive mind will no more

thrust into a conversation than it will the heart's deepest affections.

But if we cannot always talk about God, if it is sometimes inadvisable to do so—still there is one thing we can always do—one thing in which we can never go wrong. We can be prophets in our lives. And other people looking at us will confess that we have been with Jesus. The signs will be so evident.

Ninth Sunday after Trinity.

The Unrighteous Steward.

'And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles.'—Lk 16^{9}.

This verse is offered as the explanation of one of the darkest of our Lord's parables, and many feel that, instead of clearing it up, the interpretation only adds to the obscurity. But the thought in the verse is further explained by the verses which follow: 'He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?'

If, as seems certain, these verses contain the key-thought of the parable, its drift will be essentially similar to the story of the talents which we have in Mt 25^{14-30}, and that of the pounds in Lk $19^{11-13.\ 15-26}$. The real point of the teaching will be that the faithful and diligent use of lower gifts affords the training which will fit men to receive higher privileges.

There are two special thoughts in this parable. They are the need of *foresight* in the Christian life, and the *value and right use of money*.

1. *Foresight.* The difficulty of the parable is that the steward in the story was not faithful, and was (apparently) commended for his dishonesty. Why is this character given to him? The answer will probably be found in a careful study of the principles on which our Lord's parables are constructed. They are (if we may say so) works of unconscious art, in each of which there is the unity that comes of a central conception. This key-thought is thrown into the strongest possible relief by the choice of the details, which are so selected as to give it the greatest possible prominence. For instance, in Lk 18^{1-8} the judge, though representing in some sense the Heavenly Father, is depicted as an unjust, careless man. Why? Just in order to show that the perseverance of the poor widow, in the face of such difficulties, was all the more commendable. And so in this parable of the Unrighteous Steward it is the foresight, not the dishonesty, of the steward that is commended by his lord. It would be rash to say that the story could not have been so constructed as to bring out a man's foresight without making him dishonest (the story may be based upon an actual occurrence with which Jesus and His disciples were familiar); but this at least can be said, that if the man had been honest there would have been other qualities than his apparent generosity to commend him to his master's debtors, and the need for a special exercise of foresight would not have been so great. He makes friends with them by relieving them of part of their debts, in order that when he had lost his employment they might receive him into their houses.[1]

2. The foresight will lead to a *right use of wealth.* The parable teaches that material wealth is not to be rejected or despised as unclean, but to be so used as to promote the highest ends. Here is a wholesome corrective to that one-sided view, based upon such passages as our Lord's words to the rich young man, that, by the Christian, wealth is neither to be used nor possessed at all, but parted with altogether. The teaching is certainly in harmony with our Lord's practice; for He had a number of well-to-do people among His followers whom He never commanded, it would appear, literally to abandon their property.

The fact that the words 'of unrighteousness' are added after mammon or riches (for mammon is only a Syriac word for riches) affords some difficulty. But probably it is as compared with the true riches that the riches of this world are called 'the mammon of unrighteousness.' What are the true riches? Those that will stay with you; those that will not fail you. Hear St. Augustine as to these: 'You have houses and lands and servants. I blame them not—you have inherited them, or you may have justly acquired them. But true riches these are not. If you call these riches, you will lose them; and if you set your heart upon them, you will perish with them. Lose, that thou be not lost. Give, that thou mayest gain.' Give, this is the teaching. There is a special message here for to-day. The

[1] Edward Grubb, *The Personality of God*, 107.

war to a large extent swept away materialism. The money standard was no longer the determinant of life. Our riches were, to some extent at least, consecrated. And now, to-day, we are in danger of forgetting our ideal of a reconstructed land with opportunities for all. What is the remedy? It is to bring home to our minds the lesson of the right use of wealth which is taught by Christ in this parable. Christ calls us, not to repudiate money as evil, but to use it only as a means to good—to consecrate our wealth. He calls us, in the words of the text, to make to ourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christ as Mediator.

'For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.'—1 Ti 2^5.

The commentators tell us that the actual word 'mediator' is to be found only in this passage; but the idea of mediation runs right through the Bible. The Old Testament is full of mediation. There is a great deal said about the ministry of angels in the older books of the Bible. They were 'mediators,' 'go-betweens,' between God and men. And not angels only, but men also were called to this high office and mission. Moses, for instance, was the mediator between God and the people of Israel; he pleaded in the name of the people with God; he spoke as the representative and mouthpiece of God to the people. And not Moses only, but all priests and prophets were mediators, or at any rate it is true to say there was a mediatorial element in all their work and service. But all these mediators were imperfect, and their mediatorial service but partial. Paul brushes them all aside, as if they were scarcely worth reckoning, and fastens our attention exclusively on Christ, 'there is one mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus.'

What exactly is meant by the word 'mediator'? The Greek word *mesitēs*, which is here translated 'mediator,' means literally 'one who stands in the middle.' But he is one who stands in the middle for the purpose of drawing two together in a pact or covenant, or else (and here we touch the very marrow of the Pauline use of the word) he is one who stands in the middle in order to bring about a reconciliation where there has been division or enmity.

Could any title better describe the work of Christ than this word 'mediator'? He is the great Middle-man, drawing estranged parties together into concord and peace. Throughout the centuries He has been busy at His reconciling work, filling up gulfs of distrust and hate, bridging great chasms of difference, pulling down middle walls of partition and everywhere making peace. In every sphere He has been carrying on His mediatorial activities—in the individual soul, on the field of history, between man and God. And the hope for the individual and for the world lies here—that He has not abdicated His functions. The Middle-man is still at His work. And He will not cease from it till our peace shall be like a river and our righteousness like the waves of the sea.

There are three great spheres within which Christ carries on His mediatorial work:

1. He is *Mediator between God and man.* This is the sphere within which Christ does His mightiest mediating work, and in that sphere He stands alone. The very fact that a mediator was necessary proceeds on the assumption that man was sundered far from God. About this fact there can be no dispute. All life and experience bear it out.

There are two main causes of alienation from God—ignorance and sin. Let us look first at the fact that multitudes are *separated from God by sheer ignorance.* That is the condition of the pagan world at this very moment. That was the condition of the entire world before Christ came. By its wisdom it knew not God. It could only grope after God if haply it might feel after Him and find Him. And to that wandering and alienated world Christ came, as the Mediator between God and men. The Gnostics were conscious of the vast distance that separated Almighty God from mortal man, and they tried to bridge the gulf by imagining that there was an almost endless chain of spiritual beings, the first link in the chain being only a little lower than God, the second a little lower than the first, other successive links descending in spiritual excellence by subtle shades and gradations until a being was reached who was only a little better than man. That was how the Gnostic tried to mediate by these endless genealogies of his. Paul, perhaps, has these Gnostic speculations in his mind in this

passage. He brushes them contemptuously aside. For the multitudinous æons of Gnosticism he substitutes the One Mediator, the man Christ Jesus.

This is the prophetic aspect of Christ's mediatorial work. He brought God and man together by revealing to men the character of God in His own words and life. And in this respect He is the One Mediator. If Jesus was not the Revelation of God, if He was not Himself God manifest in the flesh, then God is still a God who hides Himself. Apart from Jesus we have no right to speak of God as Father. History does not reveal 'the Father.' Nature does not reveal 'the Father.' 'No man cometh to the Father but by me.' That is our Lord's own imperious and challenging claim. Leave Christ out of account, and God will be a God afar off, and we shall be back in the night of ignorance and fear. It is in Jesus that we cease to wander in some far country; we become members of the family of God, and receive the spirit of sonship by which we cry 'Abba, Father.'

Second, there is *the separation caused by sin*, and that is the separation which Paul has in his mind in the text. Sin always results in fear and estrangement. Here is how St. Paul describes the condition of the Colossians. 'You,' he writes, 'being in time past alienated, and enemies in your mind in your evil works.' Alienated, separate, strangers, enemies! No words could set forth more vividly a complete severance. And the estrangement is mutual. Sin alienates man from God, but it also alienates God from man. Sin grieves God, it offends God, it alienates God. Listen to words like these: 'God is angry with the wicked every day.' 'The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous; the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.' 'The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.' We must write a new Bible, we must for ever get rid of the words anger, wrath, consuming fire, from the descriptions of God's attitude towards men, if we are to maintain the position that alienation is only on one side.

And so, as the estrangement is twofold, the reconciliation must be twofold. Yes, Christ reconciled man to God by His Cross. In the Cross God stoops to the very death to rescue and save those who had rebelled against Him. And the vision of that mighty love changes alienation and hate into passionate devotion. We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son.

But Christ also reconciled God to man. And this also He did 'by giving Himself a ransom.' That God Himself provided the ransom makes no difference to the fact that the ransom had to be paid before man could be set free. That God Himself was 'in Christ reconciling' makes no difference to the fact that the reconciliation had to be made before God could bestow on man His forgiving and restoring grace. And Christ, again, was the Middle-man. In the Cross He represented God to man, revealing Him as a God of infinite and uttermost love; in that same Cross He represented man to God; He offered to God the sacrifice of perfect obedience, and, by bearing in His own Person the pain and penalty of sin, confessed in man's name that God's law was holy, just, and good.

2. Christ is the *Mediator between a man and his own conscience.* Sin does more than create a breach between man and God. It creates a breach between man and his own better and truer self. Sin means civil war, a divided and distracted heart; and a divided and distracted heart means misery and pain. Read the description of the civil war in that tragic seventh chapter of Romans. 'The good which I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I practise.' 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind.' 'Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?' Jesus, by blotting out a man's sins, reconciles him with his better self.

3. And, in the last place, Christ is the great *Mediator between man and man.* He has stood in many a gap in the course of the centuries and closed it up. He has mediated between individuals. What marvels of reconciliation He has accomplished! Think of this simple fact—simple but tremendous in its significance—in the circle of Christ's disciples there was at one and the same time Matthew the publican and Simon the zealot—Matthew the Jew, who had entered the pay of the Roman government, and Simon, to whom every such Jew was a renegade! But Christ laid one hand on Matthew and another on Simon, and in Him the Jewish patriot and the Roman servant became friends. And when we think of the mighty achievements already wrought by Him, we can believe that before the end of the day all separations will be brought to an end, and brotherhood will

become a blessed fact, and peace and goodwill our abiding possession.

But the special message of the text for to-day is that Christ has mediated among nations and that in the long-run all national jealousies and suspicions and hates will go down before Him. There is but one mediator between nation and nation, and that is the man Christ Jesus; and He shall mediate until war shall no more be named amongst us.[1]

When peace shall over all the earth
Its ancient splendours fling,
And the whole world give back the song
Which now the angels sing.

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 299.

The Apocryphal Gospels.

By the Reverend Alfred Plummer, D.D., formerly Master of University College, Durham.

II.

From the second to the fifth century, or even later, Apocryphal Gospels were very numerous, as is manifest from what has come down to us, and from the mention of other items by various writers. But what has come down to us is so miscellaneous, and (in the main) so fragmentary, that classification is not easy.

Various methods have been suggested. The simplest seems to be that which is based upon the *Period covered by their contents.*

Those which treat of (I.) *the Birth and Infancy of Jesus;* (II.) *His whole Life to the Resurrection;* (III.) *His Passion and Resurrection.*

I. (*a*) The first in this class (in more ways than one) is the *Protevangel of James* (*Protevangelium Jacobi*). It is very early in origin, and is comparatively free from details which shock one. It maintains the absolute virginity of Mary, and it was evidently widely read and liked. Lipsius and others have remarked that it exhibits an extraordinary mixture of intimate knowledge and gross ignorance of Jewish thought and custom, showing that the legends of which it is composed come from various sources. It contains the following account of the death of Zacharias, father of the Baptist.

Herod wished to kill John with the other infants; and Elisabeth tried to hide him. She cried: 'O mountain of God, receive mother and child'; and the mountain was cleft and received her. Herod ordered Zacharias to surrender his son. He refused, and was murdered in the Temple. When he did not come out to give the usual blessing, a priest at last ventured to go in, and he saw blood beside the altar. A voice said: 'Zacharias has been murdered, and his blood shall not be wiped up till his avenger comes.'. The priest went out and brought other priests in. Then the panellings (*τὰ φατνώματα*) of the Temple wailed, and the priests rent their garments from top to bottom. His body they found not; but they found his blood turned to stone.

(*b*) *The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, a title given to it by Tischendorf. The first seventeen chapters treat of Mary from her birth to the birth of Christ. At the age of three she was mature. The birth of Christ took place in a cave. Only angels were present, and He was able to stand as soon as He was born. Salome, the midwife, would not believe in the miraculous birth until she had made examination herself. Her hand was withered, and remained withered, until she adored the Child and touched His clothing. When He was moved into the stable, the ox and the ass adored Him, in fulfilment of Is 1[3]. The star was the largest that had ever been seen.

The next seven chapters treat of the stay in Egypt, and have some pleasing features.

The concluding portion (26–42) deals with the return to Palestine, and attributes shocking miracles to the Child Jesus, who several times strikes other boys dead for interfering with His play, and thus provokes the wrath of the populace. Mary beseeches Him to behave otherwise. 'He, not wishing to grieve His mother, kicked the hinder parts of the dead boy, and said to him: Rise, thou son of iniquity.' The dead boy rose up and went away. And then Jesus *with a word* restores the playthings for injuring which He had killed

the boy. In a similar case, 'Jesus seized the dead boy by the ear and lifted him up from the earth . . . and he revived.' An angry schoolmaster struck Jesus, and immediately fell down dead. In this portion also there are a few benevolent miracles, such as healing the hand of his brother James when a viper bit him. Being early in origin, it became widely diffused, and was greatly liked in the East. Athanasius twice quotes the legend (ch. 23) that when Mary went into a temple in Egypt with the Child, all the idols prostrated themselves and were broken to pieces (*De Incarn.* 36 ; *Ep.* lxi. 4).

(*c*) *The Gospel of Thomas* (τὰ Παιδικὰ τοῦ Κυρίου) exists in three forms of different lengths, two Greek and one Latin. They repeat a number of the incidents, both pleasing and shocking, found in the *Pseudo-Matthew*, and add others ; *e.g.* those who complained of Him to Joseph for killing children are struck blind, and are afterwards healed.

(*d*) *The Arabic Gospel of the Saviour's Infancy* supplies abundant material for our purpose. Contrasts to our Gospels are numerous and glaring. A woman took the Child's navel-string[1] and put it in a jar of nard. Her son sold unguents, but she charged him never to sell this jar. 'And this is that jar which Mary (Jn 12^3) the sinner (Lk 7^{37}) bought and poured upon the head and feet of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Mary gives the Magi one of the swaddling-bands. They take it home to their kings and chief men. They light a fire and worship it, and into it they throw the swaddling-band. It is found uninjured when the fire goes out. The water in which Mary had washed the Child's clothes works a variety of miracles. A young man was turned into a mule. Mary put the Child on the mule's back, 'and the mule became a young man, free from every defect.' Some boys were changed into kids. The Child said to the kids : 'Come, boys, let us go and play.' And immediately the kids were changed into boys.'

(*e*) *The History of Joseph the Carpenter* is a late representative of this class. It professes to have been told to the Apostles by Christ on the Mount of Olives (Mk 13^3, Mt 24^3, Lk 21^5) and is extant in both the Coptic dialects and in Arabic.

[1] This is the less revolting of the two traditions. The passage runs thus : *Itaque circumciderunt illum in spelunca ; sumsitque anus illa Hebræa pelliculam istam, dicunt vero alii eam sumsisse nervum umbilicarem, eamque in ampulla olei nardini vetusti recondidit* (cap. v.).

II. The class of Gospels which treat of the whole life of our Lord is represented by various fragments and by titles of lost Gospels, which occur in Christian writers. The often-mentioned *Gospel of the Egyptians* (κατ' Αἰγυπτίους), *i.e.* used by Egyptian converts, belongs to this class, but it need not be discussed in connexion with our subject. Much the same may be said of *The Gospel of Peter*, an intensely interesting fragment of which was dug up at Akhmîm (Panopolis) in Upper Egypt in the winter of 1886–87. In opposition to the Canonical Gospels it represents our Lord as free from pain at the moment of Crucifixion, and as being deserted by His 'Power' at the moment of Death, when He was 'taken up' (ἀνελήφθη). This implies that the Divine Christ joined the human Christ at His Baptism, and departed from the human Christ at His death on the Cross. *The Revelation of Peter* has many other strange features, but it is an Apocalypse and not a Gospel.

III. The third class of Apocryphal Gospels, like the second, is represented mainly by fragments and titles. One complete document must be noticed on account of its importance and the title which seems to have been given to it in the Middle Ages—*The Gospel of Nicodemus*. A great deal of it has the title *Acts of Pilate*, and it is his Acts in reference to Christ which are described. We have it in three forms, two Greek and one Latin. Appended to the second Greek form is an account of Christ's Descent into Hell, two forms of which are extant in Latin. The *Acts of Pilate* are based on the four Gospels, with many apocryphal additions. The Roman standards twice bow down and adore Christ. Two remarkable replies are put into the mouth of Pilate. When the Jews said that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, he replied : 'Has God said that you are not to put to death, but that I am ?' When they said that demons were subject to Jesus, he said : 'Why, then, were not your teachers also subject to Him ?' One MS. describes the suicide of Judas. He went home to get a rope to hang himself. His wife was roasting a cock. He tells her to prepare a rope : he has betrayed his Master, who will rise on the third day and punish His enemies. His wife replied : 'It is as likely that this cock will crow as that Jesus will rise.' Immediately the cock crowed and flapped its wings. Judas then made the halter and hanged himself.

Contributions and Comments.

The City and the Sanctuary.

In the February Expository Times Dr. W. F. Lofthouse reviews my conclusions regarding Ezk 48 as given in *The Princeton Theological Review* for July 1922. Several points require more consideration.

I. In the all-important question of the unit in the land-measurements, the LXX reading of 'cubits' in 42^{15-20} is impugnable, since (*a*) Its insertion, in vv.$^{17, 20}$ only, is suspiciously haphazard, and in contrast both to previous practice and to the purposeful character of the fourfold 'reeds with the measuring reed' of the M.T. (*b*) The motive for the reduction of the unit by the LXX is apparent, viz. to reconcile the dimensions of the wall with the area of Moriah. (*c*) The total of 500 cubits for the temple-complex E. to W. depends on a western wall 5 cubits thick ($41^{12, 13}$); but the surrounding wall was 6 cubits thick (40^{5}): being 500 somethings long, it must have been 500 reeds. (*d*) In the midst of ten measurements without unit in 45^{1-6} occurs one of '50 cubits': if the others are cubits, there was no object in singling out the smallest measurement to define its unit; but if the others are reeds, it was necessary to insert 'cubits' when the distance could not be expressed in reeds. (*e*) If the land-measurements are in cubits, the new unit of the reed, so prominently exhibited at the start, is practically never used:[1] while the two measuring instruments, the line and the reed, embarrass instead of assisting the understanding of the measurements. Is there any explanation of their provision, apart from the use of the line to measure cubits, the reed to measure reeds? (*f*) As the length E. to W. of Judah's portion is to correspond to the length of the oblation (48^{8}), it is, if 25,000 cubits, only about 8 miles. In such circumstances to discuss whether the eastern boundary is or is not the Jordan seems a work of supererogation.

II. Dr. Lofthouse appears inclined to concede the northern position of the priests', or most holy, portion in the oblation, if it were not for 48^{8}, which directs that the sanctuary be 'in the midst' of the oblation. But בְּתוֹכָה cannot be forced to mean more than 'within' it: it is used in 1 K 6^{19} (see R.V.) of the most holy place in Solomon's temple, which occupied an extreme position corresponding to that of the northern section of the oblation. That Ezekiel did not intend to imply by the phrase the mathematical centre of the oblation, is evident from his saying that the sanctuary is 'in the midst' of the priests' portion also (v.^{10}); on any placing of the portions these two centres are at least 2500 units apart.

III. Dr. Lofthouse's figures concerning the land are difficult to follow. The northern boundary is not 'South of Hermon,' but the entering in of Hamath[2] (47^{20} 48^{1}) 'between the border of Damascus and the border of Hamath' (47^{16}), 'Damascus, northward beside Hamath' (48^{1}). From Damascus itself to Kadesh (47^{19} 48^{28}) is over 210 miles, not 'about 160 miles.' The possibility of reserving a square of 50 miles and of allotting to each of the twelve tribes a breadth of 14 miles is therefore manifest; nor is a breadth of 14 miles 'out of all proportion' to the breadth of 20 miles given to priests and to Levites respectively. By placing the temple, which is the centre of the plan, at Shechem, the centre of the country, the correct proportion of land for northern and southern tribes is secured.

IV. Exception must likewise be taken to Dr. Lofthouse's description of the sites of city and sanctuary. A city 10 miles square and centred at Bethlehem will not stretch 'right down along the defiles into the Jordan valley'; it will lie wholly upon the mountain-land, 'a city set on a hill,' none of its buildings less than 2500 feet above the Dead Sea. The site of the temple is not 'the top of Mount Ebal'; Ezekiel saw it 'on the south' of the mountain (40^{2}), and my article consistently speaks of the site as the Vale of Shechem, an ample space for a mile-square enclosure.

V. Dr. Lofthouse makes no mention of what was described as 'in one way the most striking evidence of all'—the reference of 44^{6-8} to the uncircumcised foreigners who were offering sacrifice in the sanctuary in Israel's stead, a reference inexplicable by the history of Solomon's temple, but pointing to the

[1] After 40^{5-8}, only in 41^{8}: in each case 1 reed. In themselves these measurements afford no explanation of its introduction.

[2] Cf. Jos $13^{1, 5}$. 'There remaineth yet very much land to be possessed . . . from Baal-gad under Mount Hermon unto the entering in of Hamath.'

Assyrian subjects who were settled in Samaria, and became the ancestors of the Samaritans of Shechem.[1]

VI. To refuse my conclusion from Ezekiel's premises because it appears to render unintelligible 'the glowing hopes of Deutero-Isaiah, and the conduct of the Jews of the Return,' is hasty.[2] The same reasoning would reject Ezekiel's premises, for admittedly he intended to remove either city or sanctuary from its former site. If the sanctuary was to remain in its old place, what of Isaiah's glowing hopes concerning Zion as the city? If, on the other hand, the sanctuary was to be moved, have we any better guide to its new position, and to the bounds of the new and enlarged Jerusalem,[3] than Ezekiel's oblation plan? From the conduct of the Jews of the Return no light on the plan can be expected; they made no attempt to separate temple from city, and neither did, nor from their circumstances could, follow the land directions in any particular.

VII. Dr. Lofthouse's theory of the peripheral consciousness, involving a state of mind in which the prophet treated his native mountains as a plain, should surely be a last, not a first, resource in dealing with a passage which is at once the basis and the climax of a twelve years' mission of encouragement to 'Ye mountains of Israel'. An explanation of Ezekiel's plan which is consistent with all his directions and reveals these as neither 'hurried' nor 'ambiguous' but simple and sufficient, which agrees with the character of his writings in which the slipshod and the vague (*pace* Dr. Lofthouse) are conspicuous by their absence, which puts a positive result in place of a purely negative one, a result, too, which finds wide support both in history and in prophecy, cannot be dismissed on *a priori* grounds, or because it comes into conflict with an hypothesis of Israel's history which has never been fully proved or accepted.

C. M. MACKAY.

Glasgow.

[1] Probably the Samaritans knew nothing of Ezekiel's plan. But would it be a 'novel' and 'disturbing' conclusion if Ezekiel did appear as the father of Samaritanism? The Samaritans regarded the Pentateuch as their authority, and Ezekiel, Dr. Lofthouse holds, stood to it *in loco parentis*.

[2] Dr. Lofthouse inquires also concerning Hosea's attitude to Shechem. Hosea regarded the territory of Ephraim as 'the house of the Lord' (8[1]), 'Mine house' (9[15]).

[3] Cf. Ezk 16[46. 61], Is 33[20. 21] 54[2. 3], Zec 2[4. 5]. Ezekiel's city is evidently the 'Zion' of prophecy, his oblation the 'Jerusalem.'

Mysticism: A New Distinction.

PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN in a series of lectures, lately given in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, on *Communion with God in the Experience of Jesus* and *Communion with Christ in the Experience of Paul*, had occasion to say a good deal about mysticism. After acknowledging the difficulty which he as a German theologian felt in using the word, which might so easily be taken to be the equivalent of *mysticismus*, and thus imply the *via negativa*, he drew a distinction hitherto unnoted between Acting Mysticism and Re-acting Mysticism. While both imply 'directness of intercourse with the Deity,' in both 'an "I" speaks to a "Thou," unites with Him, lives, moves and has its being in Him'; the former is man's attempt to work upon God. Man's action is prior; by it he endeavours to produce the Divine re-action. In the latter it is God who works upon man. God's action is prior. Man's action is the response to the previous action of God. In the end the difference is equivalent to the contrast between the religion of works and the religion of grace. Dr. Deissmann suggested that before his conversion Paul's religion had been acting mysticism; after that event it was certainly of the re-acting type, as also was the religion of Jesus.

The lectures, which were of great interest, are to be published this autumn by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton.

W. E. WILSON.

Selly Oak.

'A Great High Priest' (Heb. iv. 14).

I.

I ALWAYS read THE EXPOSITORY TIMES with great pleasure. In the February number (p. 235) my attention was attracted to a note on 'A Great High Priest' (He 4[14]).

Mr. Sherman's statements led me to consult Delitzsch's Hebrew N.T. for several passages. But the result was contrary to what the above-named note would have led one to expect. It seems to me that, when it means the acting high priest, Delitzsch translated ἀρχιερεύς by הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (*e.g.* Mt 26[3], Jn 11[49. 51], Ac 22[5] 23[2ff.]; He 9[7. 25] etc.). On the other hand, when deposed high priests are referred to, he translated ἀρχιερεῖς by

רָאשֵׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים (*e.g.* Mt 2^4 16^{21}, Jn 11^{47} etc.). This is quite opposed to Mr. Sherman's contention that הכהן הגדול means the deposed high priest, and הכהן הראש the acting high priest. I should be very glad to have any help to enable me to decide which view to choose.

By the way, my copy of Delitzsch's N.T. has in He 4^{14} כֹּהֵן גָּדוֹל נַעֲלֶה מְאֹד instead of כהן ראש נדול which Mr. Sherman quoted.

K. Baba.

Osaka, Japan.

II.

In reply to Mr. Baba's request I would submit the following. Either הַכֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ or הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל might stand for 'high priest.' The former, which means literally 'head priest,' is undoubtedly the earlier phrase; the latter stands for the post-exilic 'high priest,' who was often as much a prince as a priest. When, as occasionally happens, הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל occurs in narratives in the Old Testament relating to pre-exilic times, its use is proleptic. There can be no doubt, I think, that Mr. Sherman in his note reverses the true order of the genesis of the phrases. Hence either רֹאשׁ or גָּדוֹל could be legitimately employed to translate *ἀρχιερεύς*, although the latter is naturally employed by Delitzsch for the acting high priest, as that was his generally accepted title in post-exilic times. רָאשֵׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים is quite a happy rendering of *ἀρχιερεῖς* when it stands for deposed high priests. In spite of Mr. Sherman's ingenious argument, I venture to think it will be generally felt that in He 4^{14} (*ἀρχιερέα μέγαν*) there is no reason to understand *μεγάν* in any other sense than 'great' or 'greatly exalted' (Delitzsch's נַעֲלֶה מְאֹד).

J. A. Selbie.

U.F. College, Aberdeen.

Entre Nous.

Sir William Robertson Nicoll.

The June number of The Expository Times had already gone to press on the 4th of May before the sad news of Sir William Robertson Nicoll's death reached us. His death means the loss not only of a personal friend, but of one who from the beginning was an admirer of The Expository Times.

Thirty-three years ago, when the first number of this magazine appeared, Dr. Nicoll was one of the first to notice it. Dr. Hastings always remembered this review gratefully. 'It was,' he said, 'one of those nippy notices which make a man rush to the first post and order his copy.' Sir William, mentioning it in *The British Weekly* last October, wrote: 'We take pleasure in thinking that we recognized the merit of The Expository Times when it was still little known.'

To appreciate the work of others and to show his appreciation in a practical way is one of the things for which Sir William will be remembered.

The last letter which we received from Sir William—at the time of Dr. Hastings' death—was a characteristic one, and we think it will not be out of place if we quote it here:

'I cannot say how much I was shocked and grieved by the most sad and unexpected news. The blow seemed to come very near. I never expected it, for when he kindly came to see us off at Aberdeen three weeks ago, he looked very well, though thin. He was full of energy, and we could have talked for hours if the train had not been ready to start.

I have tried to put a few things together for *The British Weekly*, but am not yet very well and find it difficult. He was a wonderful man—more wonderful than people thought, or than he allowed them to think. . . .

What a fertile mind, and what iron and continuous industry! For my part I have had work enough, and would gladly find an excuse to burrow in some quiet place. But we must take the way appointed for us.'

Already in this letter written nine months ago he acknowledged that he was 'not very well.' This admission from him meant a great deal, for we have never met any one who put up a braver fight against persistent bodily weakness stretching over many years.

He knew that he had work to do. He had great

and good ambitions, and so inflexible was his will that he succeeded in turning out an amazing quantity of work in spite of his constant ill-health. The secret of his enormous journalistic output over so many years was not only his determination not to give in to his physical disabilities, but was also his power of conserving his small stock of strength. Much of his work these last years was done in bed, where he would spend the day reading and dictating, getting up only in the evening to go for a short time into that amazing study, a description of which has found its way into most papers. There he would sit in his arm-chair at the far end of the narrow room, smoking at the fire with dozens of books lying on the floor beside him and others stretching to the door in long rows. The study was always the same all the years that we knew it, shelved to the ceiling and with every available shelf filled, with only a narrow path left on the floor. There in this study he would sit reading or dictating again, or perhaps seeing some of those friends who were allowed access to him and in whose conversation he delighted. As we write, we see him there as we saw him last—showing signs of weakness, a little restless, but eager and vital mentally, and full of interest in every subject, a stimulating talker and listener.

It is a month since Sir William's death, and during that time we have thought much about him. In what did his greatness lie and what contribution has he made to the thought of his generation? He was a brilliant journalist and a bookman, and perhaps he was more successful than any other in communicating his love of good books; but it is by his influence on the religious rather than on the literary thought of his age that he will be remembered.

He was an Evangelical of the Evangelicals. Not that his faith was narrow. What he believed he believed with understanding, and he believed also with passion. And somehow the emotional quality of his belief affected his readers—and they were found in all parts of the world—profoundly, so that to them too the Atonement of Christ became a living fact.

This is no small thing to have done.

We are glad to think that he was able to remain editor of *The British Weekly* to the last, and that during the final months he had the assistance not only of Miss Stoddart, who had been associated with him for so many years, but also of his successor, the Rev. J. M. E. Ross.

The Speaker's Bible.

We have not written about *The Speaker's Bible* before in Entre Nous. But we must do so now to remove a misunderstanding. Several of our correspondents take for granted that the matter of *The Speaker's Bible* has already appeared in The Expository Times. But this is not so. The whole of *The Speaker's Bible* is entirely distinct from 'The Christian Year.'

The Speaker's Bible was the last work on which Dr. Hastings was engaged. It was his intention to deal with the whole Bible, but before his death he had accomplished only a certain amount of the work planned. Fortunately, he left MSS sufficient for at least four years' publication at the rate of two to three volumes a year.

The Speaker's Bible is being issued in serial form. The first four monthly numbers completed the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. This has been issued in volume form also. The next five monthly numbers dealt with the first portion of St. Luke's Gospel. These were issued in volume form in June as *St. Luke, Volume I.* St. Luke's Gospel is one of the books that was not finished. Dr. Hastings was indeed working on it up to a few days before his death. There is, however, sufficient material for at least another volume, which should appear about the end of the year. St. Luke will be followed by an Old Testament book—probably Deuteronomy.

The Speaker's Bible is published in monthly numbers of 96 pages at 2s. A page contains about 800 words, a Number about 76,800 words. For the Serial Issue application should be made direct to 'The Speaker's Bible Office,' Aberdeen.

Special terms have been arranged for six-monthly and yearly subscribers at 11s. and 22s. respectively.

The price of the volumes varies according to size. The price of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* is 9s. 6d. net. That of *St. Luke's Gospel, Volume I.*, is 12s. 6d. net. The volumes may be obtained either direct or through any bookseller. The serial numbers and the first volumes are meeting with an enthusiastic reception. Up till now they have not been sent for review, but next month we hope to have space to quote some of the appreciations which have been pouring in from subscribers.

TWO TEXTS.

Matt. xxv. 27.

'WHAT Christ meant by the remarkable words "placed my money with the bankers" it is hard to define precisely, though we may gather that their general drift is that where direct opportunities for the use of our talents are not open for us, indirect opportunities for service will never be wanting in the kingdom of God, if we are only in earnest in the wish to use them. In the service of the kingdom there is not only room for, but there is need of, all men that are willing and eager to use their talents in the position to which God has called or shall call them, whether as with the vast majority they have no duties beyond the narrow circle of the household or the circumscribed routine of their daily occupation, or with the exceptional few their lives form large factors in the history of the nation.' [1]

Luke xv. 16.

'The longing of the prodigal for husks or carob-pods pictures the intensity of his hunger, and his feeding of swine the shamefulness of his servitude as a son of Abraham. He would fain have been filled with the husks, not "filled his belly," as the Authorized Version has it, for he could easily have done that, but the right reading, as in the Revised Version, denotes that he would fain have been filled—that is, satisfied with the husks that the swine did eat. The same words "to be filled" are used in Lk 6^{21}, "Blessed are ye that hunger: for ye shall be filled"—that is, satisfied to the full. But no such satisfaction was to be procured in the far country, only servitude and a famine of all that whereon the soul of man can live.' [2]

SOME TOPICS.

False Fear of God.

'"The total nature of reality" defies the philosopher to-day as utterly as it has defied the philosophers of all ages. He has no word which is really adequate even to soothe that grovelling fear of the unseen forces of the universe to which mankind is prone, and which has been the prolific root of dark, inhuman heathenisms. Sometimes, indeed, one is almost driven to wonder whether heathenism's deadly wound may not be healed; whether out of blind fear may not be born anew dreadful attempts at propitiation. There have been recrudescences scarcely less strange. And beyond all question there is a distinct, unwonted tendency nowadays to view as sinister the regnant Power of the universe. Defiant arraignment of the Higher than man furnishes to the literature of our time one of its most characteristic notes; often taking shape in blasphemies almost unquotable. "The hidden God who does not wish to give up his secrets strikes down men who seek to take them!" a French surgeon, dying from the effects of prolonged experimentation with the X-ray, was quoted, not long ago, as saying. Who can fail to feel in the words that which makes the very essence of heathenism? There is a fear of God which is not "the beginning of wisdom," but a blight, rather, on all that is highest and best in life: a craven fear, degrading to man, dishonoring to God; which it is the work of "perfect love" to cast out.'

This quotation is from *The Deeper Voice*, by Miss Annie Steger Winston (Doran; $1.25 net). The aim of the book is to point to childlikeness in the spiritual realm as 'the one remedy for the twin evils of blank pessimism and arid rationalism.'

Jesus the Wanderer.

'Jesus was a wanderer, what the well-to-do citizen of sedentary habits lounging in his doorway would call a vagabond. His life was one long journey. Before that other—who was condemned to immortality by One who was Himself condemned to death—Jesus was the true Wandering Jew. He was born on a journey, born not even at an inn, for there was no room available at Bethlehem for the pilgrim who was with child. While still at the breast He was carried along the interminable sun-scorched roads that lead into Egypt; from Egypt He returned to the waters and verdure of Galilee. From Nazareth He went frequently to Jerusalem for the Passover. John's voice called Him to the banks of the Jordan; an inner voice called Him to the desert. And after the forty days of fasting and temptation He began His restless wandering from town to town, from village to village, from hill-top to hill-top, throughout this much-divided Palestine. Oftenest we find Him in His native Galilee, at Capernaum, at Chorazin, at Cana, at Magdala, at Tiberias. But He crosses also Samaria, and loves to

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 75.
[2] *Ibid.* 166.

sit by the well at Sychar. We find Him also in the tetrarchy of Philip, at Bethsaida in the land of the Gadarenes, at Cæsarea, and even at Gerasa in Peræa of Herod Antipas. When in Judea He prefers to stop at Bethany, a few miles from Jerusalem, or at Jericho. But He does not hesitate to cross the boundaries of the ancient kingdom and go down among the Gentiles. We meet Him, in fact, in Phœnicia near Tyre and Sidon, and in Syria also, for His Transfiguration takes place on Mount Hermon. After His Resurrection He appears at Emmaus on the shores of the Sea of Tiberias, and it was finally at Bethany, near the house of him whom He had raised from the dead, that He took leave of His friends for ever.

He was the wanderer who never rested, the homeless wanderer, the wanderer for love, the voluntary exile from His own land. He Himself tells us that He has not one stone whereon to lay His head; and it is true that He possesses no couch whereon He may rest at night, nor a house He may call His own. His true home is the road He travels with His earliest followers, in search of new friends. His bed is a furrow in the fields, a bench in a boat, the shade of an olive-tree. At times He rests under the roof of a loving friend, but He is ever a passing guest whose visit is brief.' [1]

Why Jesus called Fishermen.

'It was not by chance that Jesus chose His first followers from among fishermen. The fisherman who spends the greater part of his days in solitude and encompassed by pure waters is *the man who knows how to wait.* He is the man of patience who is not pressed for time; who casts his net and leaves the rest to the Almighty. Water has its moods and the lake its fancies, and his days are never monotonous. On setting forth the fisherman knows not whether he will return with his boat full or without a single fish to cook for his evening meal. He places himself in God's hands, who sends both abundance and want. When times are hard he consoles himself with the thought of past times that were better and of better times to come. He does not seek to make money rapidly, and he is happy if he can but barter the fruits of his toil for a little bread and wine. He is clean both in mind and body, for his hands are washed in the waters of the lake and his spirit in those of solitude.' [2]

[1] G. Papini, *The Story of Christ*, 63. [2] *Ibid.* 73.

How the Mind influences the Body.

'The idea of discomfort creates discomfort. Two young students of the same faculty occupied the same room, probably for reasons of economy. One of them one night, worn out, no doubt, by overwork, felt himself choking for want of air and called his friend to his help. He, suddenly awakened, without taking time to think, seized the first thing that came into his hands and flung it at the window. There was a shower of falling glass and the choking student at once began to breathe easily. What was their astonishment next morning to find that it was not the glass of the window but the glass of the wardrobe that had been shattered to atoms.' [3]

NEW POETRY.

A. M. P. Dawson.

St. Phocas, and Other Poems (Swarthmore Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a small volume of poetry from the pen of Mr. A. M. P. Dawson. Some of the poems are of a religious nature. About one quarter are peace poems written during the War. All are serious and earnest. There are one or two descriptive poems, the longest being the one which gives its title to the book, St. Phocas; and St. Phocas, we are told, is the Gardener-Saint of Greece. The author makes large use of the sonnet form and is there at his best. We quote the sonnet on

DEATH.

This faith is mine: that when earth yields her hold
I shall renew my youth in Death's pure stream,
And my freed soul shall sing a springtide theme,
Braver yet sweeter, wiser yet more bold,
Than e'er I sang in the brave springs of old
When all the world was gladsome as a gleam
Of dancing sunlight, golden as the dream
That makes the first fair April buds unfold.
I shall awake to music, and to mirth,
To fragrance and the joys of growth and hope,
To vernal faith and love and ampler scope,
To beauty, homelike with dear hints of earth,
And thus shall Death be but a greater birth,
Of this life's edifice the crowning cope.

[3] A. Dolonne, *Self-Healing by Autosuggestion*, 54.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It has long been the fashion to censure the Jews for their particularism, but in truth there is a good deal of the particularist in all of us, or at any rate in most of us. In religion we associate most readily with those with whom we agree, and we are apt to ignore a challenge, which might be for our soul's profit, from those from whom we differ. But we have everything to gain from cultivating generous sympathies, and he must be a richly endowed man indeed who has nothing to learn from other people.

More particularly have Jews and Christians persistently misunderstood one another. They have done this from the beginning, and it is much to be hoped that they will not continue to do it to the end. Much of this misunderstanding is undoubtedly due to ignorance. Not many Jews take the trouble to acquaint themselves with the New Testament; many Christians know little of the Old Testament, while most know nothing whatever of Rabbinical Literature. Indeed, this is a field which even to many Christian scholars has been till recently, and to some extent still is, practically a *terra incognita*.

If there is one man more fitted than another to mediate between these two groups and to create, if not a reconciliation, at least an understanding, that man is Mr. Claude G. Montefiore. His is a singularly rich and impartial mind. A devoted son of Judaism, he has made a study, not only minute but sympathetic, of the New Testament documents, and whether in dealing with the one literature or with the other, he always manifestly endeavours to be scrupulously fair: he has no desire to think more highly of the one, or less highly of the other, than an honest examination of the facts obliges him to think.

In his recently published book *The Old Testament and After* (reviewed in 'Literature') his powers of skilful presentation and sane and helpful criticism are seen at their best. True, he professes to be an amateur in Rabbinical literature, and inadequately equipped for the discussion of the literature in which Greek and Hebrew thought converge; but when we consider that there has been a continuous stream of Jewish literature for nearly three thousand years, who is sufficient for these things? To say the least, Mr. Montefiore is as competent as any, and we watch with more than interest his endeavour, as he puts it, to 'absorb the good and reject the evil, whether in the Old Testament, the New Testament, or the Rabbinical literature.' In a spirit the reverse of supercilious, he stands above them all.

No one could be more refreshingly frank in his criticism of the Rabbis. 'Much of their teaching

seems childish and absurd.' 'Much of the Rabbinic study of the Law was casuistic; much of it narrowing; much of it trifling; much of it an appalling waste of time and brain.' 'Legalism lays its rather coarsening and vulgarizing hands upon every conception in heaven and earth.' An impression is given in the Talmud as if those old Rabbis were men 'with a restricted outlook, and enmeshed in a study the great mass of which was of very doubtful advantage to the world.' That on the one hand; and of all that, Christian criticism has been well aware.

But there is another side which that criticism has not been so ready to recognize. 'On the whole,' the attitude of Rabbinic literature has been 'sane and simple and broad'; it is 'a mixture of delicacy and everyday practicality.' 'God is always in the thoughts of the Rabbis.' 'The study of the Law helps a man to meekness, fidelity, and charitableness; it keeps him far from sin, and brings him near to virtue; he ought to become a lover of God and of mankind, modest, long-suffering, and forgiving of insults. The study of the Law demands a measure of endurance and asceticism; and, for the rest, reverence and cheerfulness, contentment and resignation; the student must be long-suffering and claim no merit; he must love God and man; he must not boast, he must judge his fellows favourably; he must accept reproofs willingly; he must bear the yoke with his fellows. The virtues are gentle human virtues, tending to unite and not to separate. Moreover, these gentle human virtues did not, when occasion demanded, exclude the heroic virtues as well.' Again, God is no 'cold, distant, transcendent, unapproachable Deity'; this is a 'monstrous misunderstanding of the Rabbis which can only be retained by the ignorant or the prejudiced.' And all these claims are illustrated by a wealth of quotation which those who despise Rabbinical literature without knowing it would do well to ponder.

Nor is Mr. MONTEFIORE blind to the imperfections, to what he calls the gaps and rough edges, of the Old Testament. In this connexion perhaps his most striking criticism is in his allusion to its 'comparative lack of high idealism,' 'a certain lack of *élan* and passion, of eager and redeeming philanthropy.' But Liberal Judaism, though it claims the right to be critical, is deeply rooted in the Old Testament, and there is more than one fine summary of its peculiar excellence—its conceptions of 'God's unity and righteousness, of the inseparable union of religion and morality, of social justice, pity, and love, of the love of neighbour and stranger, of the election of Israel for a religious mission and service, of the joy of communion with God.'

Of peculiar interest to Christians is Mr. MONTEFIORE'S criticism of the New Testament, and more particularly of Jesus. Often he speaks of its 'moving and wonderful words'—such words as we find in the First Epistle of John or in 1 Co 13. The Old Testament deficiency in 'eager and redeeming philanthropy' already alluded to, he finds 'most grandly filled up by the teaching of Jesus and Paul'; and he emphasizes the point that the mysticism of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John goes beyond anything we have in the Psalter. 'We have here a veritable New Testament supplement to Old Testament teaching.'

Perhaps the two most startling statements in the book occur in his estimate of Jesus. One is this: 'The universalism which we acknowledge, and for which we are grateful, in Paul, is not clearly to be found in the teachings of Jesus'—apparently not even in the story of the good Samaritan. Mr. MONTEFIORE is 'very confident that "Samaritan" formed no part of the original parable as spoken by Jesus.' The second surprise is: 'The beginning in the teaching of Jesus of a double morality.' 'It is implied that, in the fullest sense, not all men could be "disciples." Not every man could be expected to renounce all that he had, or to "hate" father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, "yea and his own life." There must be an inner and an outer ring.'

Here we must take leave to part company with the distinguished writer. The illustration which he adduces, of the young man who had great possessions, hardly proves his point. Has Mr. MONTEFIORE forgotten the 'occasional' nature of Jesus' utterances? 'If *thou* wilt be perfect, sell thy goods.' This particular demand tested the quality of that particular man's devotion to Jesus and the cause which He represented: in his case it was his possessions, as the sequel showed, that stood between him and the Kingdom: hence the demand for their renunciation. But the demand of Jesus upon every man was always for whole-hearted uncompromising allegiance, though the form it assumed would vary with the character of the man on whom the demand was made. But whether you agree with Mr. MONTEFIORE or not, you feel throughout his book that you are in communion with a gracious, friendly, and healing spirit.

One of the subjects of supreme interest to the present generation is what may be called, in a broad sense, Spiritual Healing. Christian Science, New Thought, Psycho-analysis (on its practical side) are aspects of the modern healing cult. But there is another movement that has much the same object but operates from a different standpoint and with a different equipment. Of this movement one of the most enthusiastic protagonists is the Rev. Claude O'FLAHERTY, M.B., Ch.B., Senior Chaplain at St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh.

Mr. O'FLAHERTY'S degree is to be noted, for he is both a medical man and a priest. And it may be said at once that his attitude to the medical profession is entirely respectful and sympathetic. But he has a great message to deliver and a great mission to commend to the Church, and he does both these things in a book recently published, *Health and Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). There is a great deal in the book that is interesting and valuable from a general religious standpoint. There are admirable chapters on 'Man's Relation to God,' 'The Healing Ministry of Jesus Christ,' and 'Grace and the Sacramental Principle.'

But we reach the message of the book when we come to the chapter on 'Sacramental Healing.' The author warns us, first of all, that the health of the body is to be sought not for selfish reasons but for more efficient service to God; and, secondly, that our nature is a unity. Body, mind, and spirit are so bound up with one another that a disorder in one affects the other; and Jesus came to be the Healer and Redeemer of the whole man. His healing ministry was part of a ministry of redemption and restoration for mankind.

This ministry was to be continued by His Church. 'The command to heal was as definitely and clearly given as the command to preach the Gospel and forgive sins.' And in His Spirit the Apostles continued to do the works of Christ. There is no ground for supposing that the healing of the sick by spiritual means was a temporary gift to the Church. On the contrary, there is definite and abundant evidence that for several centuries such healing was an everyday practice in the Church. And it is significant that the apologists of the early centuries cited as evidence of the truth of Christian doctrine, not the miracles of our Lord, but the contemporary works of healing which the ministers of Christ were performing in every place. It was only later, when the standard of faith and conduct became lower, that works of healing became fewer.

Out of many forms of healing in use in the early Church two persisted and are in use to-day, namely, the Laying-on of Hands and the Anointing with blessed oil. The first was enjoined by our Lord Himself, and the second is in accord with apostolic doctrine and practice. The ministers of healing were two, priests and laymen endowed with the gift of the Holy Spirit.

It is, of course, true of sacramental healing, as of every other sacramental rite, that the grace of the sacrament is received by faith. If faith flags,

healing is delayed. If faith recovers, works of healing abound. Our Lord wrought cures on the sick by spiritual means which are open to us, but it was always on condition of a believing attitude.

There is a human basis for this ministry in the close connexion of body and mind. In point of fact there are three kinds of healers—the physical, the mental, and the spiritual. Mr. O'Flaherty recognizes the place and the use both of the doctor and the psycho-therapist, but the spiritual healer does what neither of the others can do, because he deals with the deepest roots of health and disease. 'Spiritual healing, when it brings peace and order and health to the spirit, also resolves complexes in the mind, removes fear and anxiety, and gives mental peace. And mental and spiritual peace produce the conditions under which the natural vitality of the body can reassert itself and throw off disease.'

The reconciliation of the doctrine of Salvation by faith alone with an adequate view of the necessity in the Christian life of good works is not easy. Many preachers have an uncomfortable feeling that they have to bring back surreptitiously with the one hand what they have ostentatiously thrown away with the other, and do it so skilfully that 'the plain man' in the pew will not notice. 'Saved by faith alone, but not by a faith that abides alone'—by some such mediating formula, the antinomy is plausibly if not quite successfully overcome.

As if this difficulty were not enough, the 'new thought' threatens to drag into clear light another antinomy. 'Salvation by right thinking' is proclaimed with enthusiasm. Not that it has never been heard of before. Far from that. Ancient Greece was familiar with it. But it is proclaimed in a new way and with fresh sanctions.

The difficulty, however, has been lying there all the time in Scripture itself. When we consult it on the topic of right thinking, we find a perplexity not unlike that which confronts us on the subject of good works.

On the one hand we have such passages as these: 'As he thinketh in his heart, so is he' (Pr 23^{7}). 'We were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight' (Nu 13^{33}). On the other hand we have such as these: 'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall' (1 Co 10^{12}). 'Be not wise in your own conceits' (Ro 12^{16}), and a multitude of others which inculcate humility in one's thoughts of oneself.

Both sides need careful consideration, for both are true. Experience proves it. If the Israelite rates himself as a poor grasshopper, the Canaanite will soon come to agree with him. Thoughts, even imaginations, tend to realize themselves. Men always knew that more or less clearly. St. Paul knew it well when he laid down his famous rule for right thinking (Ph 4^{8}). But modern psychology has given fresh and impressive force to the fact that as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he. What he aspires after, he tends to become. What he ardently desires, he in some measure, sooner or later, receives. The content and the 'tone' of thought react powerfully on physical health, shape character, and help to secure, or to lose, for a man such desirable things as popularity and business success.

Despite the harm done to such truths by quacks and charlatans they remain truths of experience, and they make such a hymn as 'O to be nothing, nothing' sound very silly, or, if anybody ever were to take it in earnest, suicidal.

But then there is the other side, upon which Scripture and experience are just as strong. The wisdom of all the ages condemns conceit, pride, and self-righteousness as the surest way to ruin. 'Humility,' as Principal Iverach pointed out, is 'the other side of greatness,' in such wise that without humility there can be no true greatness.

Here we are, then, shut up between two seemingly contradictory statements which are both demonstrably true. If we do not think highly of ourselves, we shall never be anything; if we do esteem ourselves highly, we are on very slippery ground and have probably put great attainments beyond our reach. How to do justice to both is a pretty problem. We have never heard such a mediating formula as helped us in the case of faith and works. He who can construct one will do a great service.

These remarks have been suggested by a book which seems to us quite worth consideration on one side of the antinomy, *Life's Practical Philosophy*, by Charles Wase (Rider; 4s. 6d. net). On the whole subject of right thinking it is not good, for it ignores the other side of the antinomy. As a practical philosophy of life it is sadly deficient. It has no place for salvation from sin in any real sense of either of the terms, and no place for Christ except as 'the Great Master.' Its salvation is essentially salvation of the individual by himself through his own inner resources, guided only by great examples. We have no manner of faith in that.

But if one is sound on the essentials of the Christian salvation and regeneration, and can in consequence pass on without misunderstanding to the working out of his own salvation as the Apostle enjoins, he will be helped by what our author has to say on the prime necessity of right thinking and on what manner of things should occupy one's thoughts. Many good quotations might be given. Let these suffice:

'Remind yourself continually of the presence within you and within others of the Ideal Self, which is a successful, happy, and healthy self. You are continually painting mental pictures. See that you paint the pictures of a happy, healthy, and harmonious life and its right attainment. Right desire will make these pictures real and living, when you follow it with right action.'

'Thoughts of health, confidence, strength, and intelligence will help to develop these essential qualities in you. You will never be able to do things if you think you cannot. With your thoughts concentrated upon reality—think and affirm—"I am such and such in the ideal, real world" and be it in actual expression. With this mental attitude you can trust . . . that all the forces of the Universe are working with you.'

There is a striking article in the June number of the *Church Missionary Review* by Constance L. Maynard, with the challenging title 'Are Missions to the East Needed?' In view of the difficulties, is missionary effort worth while? It is true our race is gifted with a love of adventure and a great power of endurance. We have also an exceptional power of dealing with the less civilized races; and our word is everywhere trusted and respected.

But consider the contra account. There are the by no means negligible physical troubles—malaria, fevers, dysentery, dangers. There are the indifference, hostility, cruelty of human beings. There is the constant strain of labour and disappointment and deprivation. There are isolation and exile, weariness, want of sympathy. And, amid all, the continual demand for courage, patience, and cheerfulness. Put what you like on the other side, yet let us not be under delusions as to what we have to face.

There is a great deal more. And the question puts itself in view of it all: Have we something to give to non-Christian nations that is of such supreme value that we are willing to pay a price which is heavy, however you look at it? There can be no doubt about the answer when we consider only uncivilized peoples. The terrors of magic and witch-doctors, the cruelty to infancy and old age, the degradation of women, the fear of evil spirits—all this has been swept away and the souls of men have been led into light and liberty.

But it is another matter when you look at the great organized religions. Why should not one form of religious faith appeal to one type and another form to another? The mental equipments of East and West are very different. So long as the religion of non-Christians has some control of a reasonable kind over conduct, so long as it satisfies *them* and gives them hope and inspiration, why should we disturb them? That is a question that is asked by many cool observers, travellers, and even residents in non-Christian lands.

Look at the four great religions. There is Muhammadanism. It starts from the opposite end of truth from Christianity, from the metaphysical. It emphasizes the transcendence of God and a sovereignty that is hard and unbending. Predestination is absolute; the future is as unalterable as the past. All that Christianity stands for is wanting in the God of Muhammadanism. Buddhism, on the other hand, emphasizes the immanence of God. It is nearly identical with pantheism. God is impersonal, and man is but a dewdrop that slips into the shining sea of the eternal life. His future is the stripping off of the shadow of personality which he possesses on earth.

The third of the great religions is Hinduism. It is a religion of rites and rules. At its heart is the passionate desire for an incarnation of the unseen God who is behind everything. This desire is satisfied by its 330 million gods, who are personifications of nature-processes. Morality does not count in this pantheon, and the Hindu faith leads to an utter confusion between good and evil. Its 'holy men' may be good; they may also equally be brutish, malign, and wicked. The fourth religion, Confucianism, is 'the religion of a gentleman.' It is good form. In point of fact it is more an ethic—a kindly, brave ethic—than a faith. It is so sound that Dr. John Mott has said, 'If you want to sow the good seed on paving-stones, go to South America; and if you want to sow it on ploughed land, go to China.'

What, then, have we to give to these peoples? The Muhammadan needs everything that is connected with the Incarnation. The Buddhist needs the conviction of personality, in both God and man. For him we have 'the gift of eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' The undying thirst in Hinduism for a God who is near and real points straight to the central message of the Gospel, and India is crying out for this. In China the soil is open and prepared, and what China needs is a spiritual message, the evangel of the grace of God.

Christ is the desire of *all* nations. The four great religions we may surely regard as parts of the preliminary revelation of God, calling men to Himself. They are broken lights of Him, and in His truth and grace He is more than they. Each of them is 'a prayer for life,' and in Him is the life.

What doth the Lord require of thee? To a religious person no question can be more important than that. And already in the Old Testament comes the immortal answer: 'To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.' The answer is simplicity itself. Duty is defined in terms of social service inspired by religion. Justice, love, and a humble walk with God—that is all.

But is that really all? Yes, Micah seems to say, that is all. For his words are not merely a statement, they are a protest—a protest against the rivers of oil and the rams and the calves and the burnt-offerings, which seemed to his contemporaries so indispensable an element in the service of God. Emphatically these things formed no part of the divine demand. So at least thought Micah.

And he is not alone in thinking this. Prophets both before and after him thought the same. Indeed, two of them went further and maintained that animal sacrifice had never formed any part of that demand—not at any rate in the only period which for this purpose mattered, that is, in the good old days of Moses, when Jahweh had so signally

revealed His gracious will towards Israel. 'Was it sacrifices,' Amos asks, 'and offerings that ye brought unto me in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' And the answer is most evidently, No. Then and now and evermore the divine demand is that justice roll like water, and righteousness like a perennial stream. A century and a half afterwards we find Jeremiah giving expression to the same view of history and of God. 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices.'

The evidence of the prophets on this supreme question is not extensive, but it at least seems to be explicit. Isaiah represents Jahweh as saying, 'I delight not in the blood of bullocks,' and Trito-Isaiah, pouring scorn on the ritual fasting of his day, asserts that the fast which is truly acceptable to Jahweh is the fast from social injustice, which will come to expression in clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, freeing the oppressed. To men like these it would seem as if the whole priestly way of life were simply an irrelevance. Their attitude is summed up most succinctly by Hosea when he says, in words which seem to have been specially dear to our Lord, 'I will have mercy, *and not sacrifice*.'

More wonderful still, this attitude is shared by some of the psalmists. 'Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in, burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required.' 'Thou delightest not in sacrifice, thou hast no pleasure in burnt-offerings.' The psalmists, like the prophets, are not merely negative. If they can tell us what God has no delight in, they also know what He does delight in and demand. In the prophets, not sacrifice, but mercy; in the psalmists, not sacrifice, but 'a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart.'

'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.' It seems impossible to evade the simple force of these and the similar words already quoted. Yet many modern scholars hesitate to take them at their full face-value. It is urged, on the one hand, that the prophets, like many a public speaker, made occasional use of the language of hyperbole, in order to direct attention to an aspect of truth which their hearers were ignoring. It is urged on the other hand that, as children of their time, they could not have broken so completely with the traditions of their people, and could not have hurled so radical a criticism at institutions and practices universally accepted by the contemporary world. Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago, in his recently published *The Moral Life of the Hebrews* (reviewed in 'Literature'), maintains, for example, that 'a religion without ritual would have been practically inconceivable to the Hebrew mind, and the prophets never ceased to be Hebrews.' The question is clearly then, in part, how much originality may be ascribed to the prophets.

The evidence, as we have said, however meagre, seems explicit, but apparently it is not unambiguous, judging by the various interpretations put upon it by modern scholars. Let us hear some of them. Professor Smith, whom we have just quoted, says: 'It will hardly do to make Amos wholly discard ritual and put ethics in its place. . . . He was not consistently hostile to ritual. . . . It is safer to assume that he is protesting not against ritual *per se*, but against making ritual do service for character and right conduct.' Let us hear Professor T. H. Robinson. While admitting in his *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel*, that 'Hosea and Jeremiah had no use for sacrifice,' he goes on, 'Pre-exilic Prophets would not, perhaps, have swept it away altogether; their concern was to see that men realized that religion was a moral and spiritual thing, and not merely a ritual one.' And again, 'The attitude of the earlier prophets might have been different had the ritual been of that purer type which the Law maintained,' though Dr. Robinson frankly adds that 'they would never for an instant have endorsed the contention that ritual of any kind was among the absolute demands of Yahweh.' Similarly the late Professor R. A. Aytoun in his *God in the Old Testament*: 'At first

sight,' he says, the prophets 'appear to advocate a purely ethical and spiritual religion from which all outward forms in worship are banished as utterly irrelevant and valueless.' But 'it did not necessarily follow that if the heart and life were right even then there was no place for the outward and visible in worship; but what value these might have they did not suggest.'

Now let us hear the other side. In *Altar, Cross, and Community*, Professor W. F. Lofthouse in a striking paragraph argues: 'The prophets do not say, "No rite is of use while the heart is wrong." They never imply that it will be of any use when the heart is right. What they would have said if they had been discussing pure and untainted sacrifices we do not know. But the fact that in discussing debased sacrifices they spoke of sacrifices as a whole suggests the answer.' Emeritus Principal Skinner takes the same line. 'It is commonly held,' he remarks in *Prophecy and Religion*, 'that the prophets' repudiation of sacrifice was not absolute, but relative to the prevalent delusion that cultus apart from morality has an inherent value in the sight of God. That is to say, they did not reject sacrifice as such, but only as offered by a people that had lost the true knowledge of God. It seems clear, however, that the prophetic principle goes further than that. Not only is sacrifice of no avail as a substitute for righteous conduct, but a perfect religious relationship is possible without sacrifice at all. . . . They never demand a purified ritual, but always and exclusively the fulfilment of the ethical commands of Yahwe.' Finally, let us hear Mr. C. G. Montefiore. In *The Old Testament and After*, he defines 'the great prophetic achievement,' which he describes as 'of deathless importance,' thus: 'That the worship and the offerings which God asks and likes, demands and cares for, are not sheep and goats and incense and oil, but justice, confession, contrition, and the pure heart.'

Where doctors differ, what is the plain man to do? Two things he may do. He may say that the prophetic conception of religion is not exhaustive: the priest must be heard too. Or he may say that the prophets are the supreme interpreters of religion and that they mean what they say, without mitigation or modification. If it be argued that so bold a challenge of the universal ritual customs in which they had been brought up is simply inconceivable, it may be answered that with men of their insight and calibre, it is precisely the inconceivable that is possible. Isaiah and his brethren in prophecy were very bold. And it may well have been that their conception of animal sacrifice as an irrelevance and a futility—if that was indeed their conception—rested upon profound conceptions of the ultimate nature of God which they would have been prepared to defend by argument, had argument been their province. For did not even a psalmist represent the God he worshipped as saying:

> Will I eat the flesh of bulls,
> Or drink the blood of goats?

The Structure of St. Paul's Hymn of Love.

By the Reverend F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., The Rectory, Kinnitty, King's County, Ireland.

The following is an attempt to show that this famous hymn was originally written in metre. It would seem that the apostle had before his mind in the pleasant hours of composition such lyrical passages as the choral odes in the later plays of Euripides. He appears to have noticed the skill with which that dramatist and others blended and varied their metres. The ode seems to fall naturally into four divisions, with points of transition between each—each of the four having again three parts

resembling in some way the strophe, antistrophe, and epode of the Greek ode and chorus, on a much smaller scale and with some general, though not the same precise, correspondence. For example, the first strophe would be :

ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις (Dochmiac)
τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Dispondeus)
λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων (Troch. with iambic base)
ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω (Troch. with anacrusis)
γέγονα χαλκὸς ἠχῶν (Troch. syzygy)
ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζων (Iam. dim. cat.).

And the last epode would run :

νυνὶ δὲ μένει (spondee, anapæst)
πίστις ἐλπὶς ἀγάπη (cretic, 4th Pæon) cf. *Electra* (S.), 1384 (Jebb)
τὰ τρία ταῦτα (Dactyl, spondee)
μείζων δὲ τούτων (dochmiac)
ἡ ἀγάπη (choriamb.)
Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην (dactylic, with base) cf. *Ketides, Aisch.* 526 (Paley).

There are parallels to each of these lines in the Greek dramatists. The whole poem can be written out, as I have found in this way, Dochmiacs being numerous.

It is remarkable how well the matter and form correspond all through. This shows something of the author's care. We may also see the influence of Pindar in the fourfold division of the poem. In ten of his odes Pindar has four systems of triads, based, it would seem, on the divisions of the Greek Temple, which often had three, and in some cases four compartments. *Ol.* vi. 1–3 might be rendered 'placing golden pillars under the well-built vestibule we shall build as it were a stately temple (*megaron*) of song.' *Megaron* is rendered 'palace,' but in Herodotus it is used of a shrine, and Pindar speaks of his daughters worshipping in his own chapel (*prothuron, Pyth.* iii. 78). In the temples of Athena at Athens, and of Diana at Ephesus, we have the four divisions: *prothuron* or porch, *pronaos* or vestibule, the *naos* or shrine, and the *opisthodomos*, which was the treasury. This fourfold division of the classic temple may well be reproduced in certain of Pindar's odes and in this Psalm of Love. In Pindar the divisions are connected by some word, just as in this hymn we have links between the divisions—like doors of connexion. We shall see that the four divisions of the hymn correspond in character, position, and importance to those of the great Greek temple. The first section comprises vv.[1-3]; the second, vv.[4-8a]; the third, vv.[8b-11]; the fourth, v.[12]–14[1a], the link between 1 and 2 being 'that I may boast' (v.[3]) the second section enlarging on the absence of boastfulness in Love; the link between 2 and 3 being 'never faileth' (v.[8]), the third section describing the passing of various gifts; the link between 3 and 4 being 'child' (v.[11]), which suggests the contrast between the puerile present and our future manhood to be developed in a sphere of glorious vision and ripest knowledge.

The opening words of this ode conjure up in our imagination a scene of life, bustle, and worship before one of those classic temples, like that of Diana or the Parthenon. We see the worshippers, Juvenal's 'raucous crowd,' walking in procession through the street, dancers and musicians among them. With clanging of cymbals and beating of tambourines they advance, rejoicing in their pagan ceremonial, whereas 'Love rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth' (v. 6). Such a procession is described by the Roman poet Catullus, who died 54 B.C. (lxiii. 21, 28 f.). 'When the voice sings to the cymbal, when the tambourines (*tympana*) resound, the procession suddenly bursts forth into shouts (*ululat*) with quavering tongues' (*linguis*).[1] In this passage we have, as in St. Paul's hymn, the cymbal and the tambourine (χαλκὸς ἠχῶν, resonant bronze, *i.e.* the *tympanum*), the metal globes of the former and the little bells of the latter making a clashing noise. We have also the *shouts* of the people in both, *ululat* and ἀλαλάζων (L. marg.), literally, to shout *alalai* or victory. The masculine participle means shouting loudly to the accompaniment of the cymbal; the neuter refers to the triumphant clanging of the cymbal, but it is the band that shouts in Catullus, and here the same idea seems preferable, as the Greek verb is seldom used of musical instruments. We have also the *tongues* of men in both. Similar parallels are found in Propertius (iv. 7), who refers to the round bronzes (*aera*) of Cybele; in Ovid (*F.* iv. 213), who says, 'they beat *cymbals* for spears and tambourines (*tympana*) instead of shields,' when describing the *Deæ comites* at their services. Juvenal (vi. 515) speaks of the '*rauca cohors* with their plebeian

[1] 'Ubi cymbalum sonat vox, ubi tympana reboant,
Thiasus repente linguis trepidantibus ululat.'
'Where the voice shouts to the accompaniment of cymbal.'

tambourines.' Horace (*Sat.* ii. 3. 223) compares the noise of the worshippers to that of thunder 'circumtonuit Bellona'; and Euripides speaks of the 'voice of the bronze' (χαλκοῦ αὐδά, *Hel.* 1346). These parallels make it probable that St. Paul was thinking of just such a procession moving forwards with upraised voices and bands playing to the temple of a pagan divinity, making the day or night hideous with noise. Without Love, he says, a man were no better than such shrieking votaries of raging Bellona or the Mother of the Gods. Indeed, without Love, one were no better than the instruments of bronze or the noisy cymbals the pagans played, singing to their accompaniments lewd songs. This is the first reflexion of the writer suggested by the scene he is thinking of. The worshippers preceded by their priests have ascended the steps, and reached the *porch* (*prothuron*) and passed between its massive columns, through the lofty doorway into the *vestibule* (*pronaos*). There the people must wait, for only the priests may enter the shrine (*naos*) where the image stands. Outside the others remain in the outer hall of statuary and paintings awaiting the return of the priests from the shrine of the mysteries. And the writer reflects that *without Love* the knowledge of the true mysteries of the true God (1 Co 4[1]) to which he has already referred in this letter, mysteries which far transcend in importance and spirituality and purity the most guarded and sacred secrets of the esoteric religions of the pagan world, and into which only the perfect (οἱ τέλειοι) were admitted, were nothing, not even the faith that could remove mountainous obstacles to good living. No illumination of spiritual light following the darkness of the most dread mysteries of the Grecian world, not even the inner illumination of the spirit of Christian prophecy, is of any avail even when following the most complete self-surrender without Love (vv.[3. 4]). This is another reflexion of the writer. The sight of their mysteries may mean life[1] to the votaries of pagan cults, but they are nought without Love. Even we, who have the fuller and grander vision of the great realities that are eternal, we only see, as it were, reflexions in a mirror, and these at best obscure (ἐν αἰνίγματι),[2] because Love is not yet fully ours, nor are we fully His. But when the imperfections of time have given place to the perfect realization that is to be, then we shall have the full distinct vision of Love face to face. His glory and beauty shall be revealed to us as clearly as our hearts have been revealed to Him, and we shall see and understand that Love is greater than all. This is the sublimest reflexion of the writer (vv.[9-13]). And he makes it as he stands in thought in the sacred shrine (*naos*), where only the priests and the initiated may enter, and where the divinity is supposed to be. Behind the shrine is the fourth compartment of the temple (the *opisthodomos*). Here the treasures are kept. Behind the shrine of Athena in the Parthenon was the public treasury to which Aristophanes refers (*Plutus*, 1193). There he places the statue of Plutus to guard the treasury (*opisthodomos*) of the goddess. Demosthenes (*c. Timocratem*) refers to the burning of this treasury by the defaulting treasurers. Behind the *naos* or shrine in the Temple of Diana was the richest and safest bank in the East. Accordingly, we may say that the four divisions of the Hymn correspond in character, position, and importance to those of the temple. We have four systems in it, each divided into three sections. The first system comprises the three opening verses beginning with 'if with the tongues of men,' and ending with 'I am nothing benefited.' It is a recital of Christian charismata and characteristics. This we might call the *prothuron*, or pillared portico. For it is on such pillars as prophecy, knowledge, faith that the Christian's life is uplifted, for faith is the foundation or supporting pillar[3] of things hoped for, that which establishes logically the things unseen. 'Faith essentially deals with the future and with the unseen, *the regions not entered by direct physical experience*.'[4] Here we stand before the door of the Temple of Love. In the second system the nature and character of Love are set forth in terms that recall the features of the Christ—the 'Love' of St. Paul. It begins with the words 'Love suffereth long' and concludes with 'never faileth' (vv.[4-8a]). This is the vestibule of the Temple, for

[1] Soph., Frag. 719 (Dind.), 'Thrice happy they go to the world below having seen these mysteries. For them alone is life there, for all others there is misery'; cf. Plato (*Phædo*, 69) on the fate of the uninitiated.

[2] Æschines, *c. Ctesiph.*, contrasts the obscure and the clear in the same way, not through *enigmas* (δι' αἰνιγμάτων), but clearly (ἐναργῶς). Euripides (Rhesus, 754), 'not in *enigmas*, for he speaks *clearly*' (σαφῶς).

[3] ὑπόστασις, cf. Pindar, *Ol.* vi. 1. ὑποστάσαντες προθύρῳ κίονας—placing the pillars under the portico. Ez 43[11] of *foundation* of house. Cf. Ps 68[2].

[4] Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 352.

we have passed through the great door into the *pronaos*, and on the threshold of the sanctuary we listen to a rehearsal of the qualities and virtues of Love preparatory to entering the shrine itself. Now we enter the shrine (*naos*)—the third section. Here we see no image, no statue that might fall, for Love never *falls* nor fails,[1] but we stand in the presence of Reality. The shrine is empty of all the most coveted gifts—'prophecies, tongues, knowledge'—and possessions of men. They have but temporary scope, but Love lasts for aye, invisible and eternal. Love only is here. His Presence, for we may regard Love as a portrait of Christ, is indicated in a subtle manner by the absence of all that is temporary and provisional. In the presence of Love these things appear to be but childhood's toys or dreams (τὰ τοῦ νηπίου). They have served their purpose, we have no more use for them; but Love is eternal, and His purpose is ever to serve. "He that would be greatest of you will be your servant,'[2] as Love once said. This, the third system of the ode, begins with the words, 'Whether there be prophecy,'[3] and concludes with 'I have put away the toys of the child' (v.[11]). Leaving the toys of childhood behind us we pass by a logical transition into the last of the compartments of the apostle's muse. As in the *opisthodomos* at Ephesus and Athens the treasures were stored for safety behind the shrine; so here, in the Treasury of the Temple of Love, its *opisthodomos* are the true Treasures of Life; and we are reminded of what Love once said: 'Treasure up for yourselves treasures in heaven' (Mt 6[20]). And the treasures are faith, hope, and love, which can only be won by those who have passed through the porch, vestibule, and shrine of Love, under whose sublime guardianship they dwell secure. When 'face to face' with Reality, Love Himself, we shall perceive at once that Love is supreme over all, even our faith and hope, which Love creates, unites, sustains. Our present view of Love is nothing when compared with the future vision. The very looking through the apartments of this vast temple is likened unto the gazing at their reflexion in the bewildering obscurity of a mirror, standing at gaze before 'the boundless rays of golden mirrors'[4]. We enjoy a sight, beautiful, indeed, but confused and dark when compared with the vision that is to be. The fourth and last section contains vv.[12-13], 14[1], 'pursue love' and perhaps 12[31], 'the highest road of all.'

This analysis shows that the writer had a definite scheme before his mind. He did not compose his poem in a haphazard way, but gave much toil, study, and care so as to present it in its finished beauty and facile grace, a very triumph of the *ars celandi artem*, a veritable 'God-built work' as Pindar styled his ode. The metrical systems employed also show that the movement corresponds to the thought. The apostle's evident knowledge of Plato's description of Love (*Eros*) in the *Symposium*, 195–197, in rhythmical and balanced phrases, may explain why he chose to express himself similarly when dealing with a grander and holier theme. That St. Paul knew the passage can easily be shown. St. Paul personified *Agape*, as Plato personified *Eros*. '*Eros* neither injures (*adikei*) nor is injured'; *Agape* 'rejoiceth not in injustice' (*adikia*). *Eros* 'does not show violent resentment,' while *Agape* 'is not provoked.' *Eros* 'is distinguished by *good form*,' for there is war between 'bad form' and '*Eros*,' while *Agape* 'does not show *bad form*.'[5] *Eros* 'is master of pleasures and desires, showeth gentleness, removeth harshness, loveth to give friendliness, does not show hostility, is propitious to the good, observed by the wise, envied by those who have it not . . . is our pilot in labour, *the adornment of gods and men*, best of leaders whom every singer should follow.' St. Paul implies the self-mastery of Agape, its freedom from envy and selfishness, its kindly offices. He might speak 'with the tongues of men and angels,' but without this 'adornment of divine beings and men' his words would only have the ring of brass. Plato *bade the singer follow Eros*; Paul bids the Christian pursue *Agape*. This theory of the Hymn also throws light upon, and is illuminated by, the words πάντα στέγει —the central idea and the central phrase of the poem. In Tregelles' edition the chapter has twenty-five lines, and στέγει is the middle word of the thirteenth line. It may be regarded as the key to the understanding of the poem. R.V. and A.V. render 'beareth all things.' The verb is used of keeping out water, guarding secrets, being proof against spears. None of these passages gives the required sense, their meaning being expressed by

[1] πίπτει (ℵABC), ἐκπίπτει (Syr. and West.), cf. 'standeth or *falleth*,' πίπτει, Ro 14[4]; ἐκπίπτειν of shipwreck; hissing off stage.

[2] Mt 23[11], where μείζων ὑμῶν corresponds to μείζων τούτων in v.[18].

[3] The singular is required by v.[2].

[4] *Hecuba*, 924.

[5] ἀσχημονεῖ—a Platonic word.

ὑπομένει, endures, and the condensed style does not admit of tautology. A messenger in Æschylus announces that the enemy are repulsed, and that the tower still *protects* the people. Antigone says, 'the battlements *protect* the city.'[1] Love can hardly be described as keeping out all things like water, or holding everything like secrets, or being proof against all things like spears, but it can be said to shelter and cover all things, in the sense of affording a universal shelter without prejudice or partiality, taking all under its protective wings, covering all with its roof (στέγη). This love that covers all things recalls Love's simile of the mother-bird gathering her chickens under her wings, and the invitation Love once gave: 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary, and I will give you rest for your souls' (Mt 11^{28}). We are reminded of a sheltering canopy, broad as the heaven above, wide stretched over all, to protect, cover, and defend. In the Father's house are many abiding-places but only one *roof* (στέγη), the Divine love that covers all men and things under the folds of its ample protection.

This supports the theory that the ode is constructed upon artistic and architectonic principles. Love is the royal dwelling or στέγη, like the residence of the Atreidai (Agam. 1055). Hecuba (1009) used the word of the treasure vaults of Athena which contained gold. Love is not only a royal dwelling, it is a treasure-house; it is more, 'it is a divine residence, a temple in the highest sense, a place set apart for work and worships. The abode of Love is one of the abiding-places (μοναί) of the Father's house (Jn 14^{2}). For the halls of hope and faith and love abide (μένει) (1 Co 13^{13}). Their treasure can never be stolen from those who have found a shelter under the *roof* of love (Mt $6^{20f.}$). This ode, therefore, is a God-built work (θεόδματον χρέος). It describes the Temple of Love, through whose many chambers we are permitted to pass, and of whose treasures we are admitted to a sight, which is brief or lasting in the same degree as we possess the Spirit of Love.

As we look back upon this little poem, a Greek ode in miniature, we notice the wonderful effects obtained by assonance and repetition. The changes are rung like musical chimes upon certain words and phrases[2] which recur at almost regular intervals, and which find echoes and responsions throughout. Professor Bury has pointed out the same phenomenon in the Pindaric odes. In the first verse the jingling effects of the words represent the sounds of the instruments. In the third verse καυχήσωμαι (ℵAB) is manifestly right. It is required to harmonize with words before and after which have χ. καυθήσωμαι is wrong; it introduces an inharmonious sound and an incongruous idea. It reads like a Western correction of the other word which is the connecting link between its own and the following section, where we are told that 'Love is no braggart' (v.[4]). The burnings at Rome under Nero (A.D. 64) and the reference to Dn 3^{8} (Theod.) obscured this point. The true parallel is in Appian's history, where an orator descends from the platform and offers himself[3] to any one who wished to arrest him. The apostle says in 54 (Autumn), 'Though I give up my body to imprisonment, so that the boast be mine, but if Love be not mine, no benefit is mine.' Two and a half years after (May 57) he put himself into the power of his enemies. This pathetic and prophetic note is lost by the changing of one letter.

[1] *S. c. Theb.* 794, στέγει δὲ πύργος. *O. C.* 15, πόλιν στέγουσι.

[2] *e.g.* 'If I have not Love' (3); 'Love' (4); 'it shall be done away' (4); 'child' (5); etc.

[3] παρεδίδου τὸ σῶμα, see Wetstein.

Literature.

A BASIS OF BELIEF.

Constantly the rocks are being ground down and the land gnawed away, and yet the earth persists, and this because the streams keep no less constantly building up new lands, which gradually rise above the waters and form the homes of many generations. And so though, theologically, this age of ours seems a time of cataclysm and destruction, the faith is wholly safe. For many eager minds, working on the task of reconstruction, are fashioning new wine-skins, so that, when the old so obviously wearing away do give, the precious wine may not be spilt. Here, for example, is Dr. Percy Gardner taking a

hand at it. He tells us that he has written *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d.) because the coming on of old age warns him that it is time to set down in final form the conception of Christian belief to which he has been led. But of ageing there is never a sign. Here are the alertness of outlook, the nimbleness of mind, the shrewd kindly eyes that scan us so closely, the subtle fingers that read the pulse of the time with uncanny accuracy, above all the sincere soul that, reverent to the past, still claims its right of coming to Christ direct and thinking Him out at first hand for itself—all indeed to which he has accustomed us. How wise is his protest that 'the ordinary Christian teaching about God needs infinite stiffening'; how natural his wonder at the flabby good nature we mistake for Holy Love, in view of the fact that 'never before in the history of the world were the workings of Divine righteousness so manifest'; how true his argument that, in recoil from the way of contemplation, our practical benevolence so fills our minds as to obscure the need of worship; how accurate his sense that Christianity and immortality and materialistic socialism are standing face to face, and the thing must be fought out. His favourite metaphor is that as an iceberg topples over and reveals a new side of itself, so from time to time must truth. He feels that the progress of relativity, of religious psychology, of the comparative study of religions, and the changed views of early Christian history make a restatement of the faith imperative. Moreover, he is sure that for the majority of folk the old metaphysical method has grown obsolete, that such speculations are to the average man a foreign language in which he cannot think. And in his attempted reconstruction he discards that, starts out from the facts of our own personality and experience as revealed to us by modern thought, and seeks to revise the creed in the light of history and psychology. Very arresting is his study under those powerful lights of the nature of personality, of the subconscious and the superconscious, of spiritism, of the claims of Spirit, and much else. Not a page but has its sentences that set the brain thinking hard, and not a chapter but rises at times into noble eloquence, as in that striking passage where he shows how man, seen and gone, can take his part in the vast process of creation which began before the earliest geological times and goes on into the infinite future. But the deeper the book wades, it grows the more impressive, and it is when face to face with such central things as God and personality, and the Person of Christ, that it grips one the most. Dr. Gardner exults that God is holy and will in no wise bend His laws aside to make exceptions in our favour. He is not helped much by talk of the Absolute: 'as He is revealed to men He shows a side kindred to personality'; he knows that God is real because when we approach Him we have experiences similar to those we know when with the best of men, whereas 'if God were a mere subjective projection this would not happen.' But it is on Jesus Christ that Dr. Gardner meditates the most. He says that the Church is built up on the hyphen which connects 'the human and historic Jesus with the exalted and mystic Christ,' and with that launches out into his main theme.

He thinks that too many of us still know Christ after the flesh and not after the spirit, hence the worship, all too common, as he says, of Jesus, who is not worshipped by Paul, of Jesus, 'through the veil of whose life' we only dimly see that Eternal Christ who has been the real inspiration of the Church. You ask just what is this Eternal Christ? He answers, 'The side of God turned towards the world.' 'The eternal Christ is the immortal reality, of which the human Jesus was the reflection in the visible world.'

There is much beauty in this section of the work. But also not a little haze, which at times thickens almost to a fog. Nevertheless the sunshine of a very devout faith keeps breaking through.

EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

The Rev. Adam Fyfe Findlay, D.D., has a sane and sure mind. And therefore when in his Kerr Lectures he tells us that no one can really know a country who keeps only to its main thoroughfares, and with that makes for *Byways in Early Christian Literature* (T. &. T. Clark; 10s.), we can follow with the comfortable assurance that we are in the hands of a reliable and clear-headed guide. This study of the early non-canonical writings is admirably done, like a bit of carpentry put together workmanlike out of clean, sweet-smelling wood. It is scholarly; it is thorough; above all it is lucid. It moves on like a clear, slow-flowing river. Embark on it, and, if it be new to you, you will find the country through which it winds full of interest. Even if it be familiar, Dr.

Findlay will hold your attention by the discussions into which the various landmarks lead him; the Jewish gospels bring him face to face with our Lord's baptism, the Petrine fragment with the descent into Hades; the gospels of the childhood run out into a little study of Mariolatry, the Acts of Thomas into one on the Sacraments and another on the Hymn of the Soul. And always, surely, it is moving to consider the various endeavours of these ardent followers of Christ to explain Him to themselves, and to translate Him into their particular thinking, attempts which we now see to be so obviously inadequate; and very humbling to remember that later generations will no doubt look back at our doctrines and our musings, which seem to ourselves so satisfactory and final, with the same puzzled look of wonder on their faces with which we read these old attempts, and the same sheer bewilderment that we should have missed so much that stares at us, and should have been so easily content.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND AFTER.

It is long since we learned to respect the weighty words of Mr. Claude G. Montefiore. Whether he speaks of Judaism or of Christianity, he has always to be listened to as one who has long and lovingly sought the truth. Once more he has put us all under a heavy debt by his massive and informing book, *The Old Testament and After* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). In successive chapters the first of which runs to two hundred pages in length, he deals with 'The Old Testament,' 'The Advance of the New Testament,' 'The Advance in Rabbinic Literature,' 'Hellenistic Contributions,' and 'What Liberal Judaism has sought and is seeking to achieve.'

The writer's purpose throughout is to emphasize such moral and religious features in these successive developments of the Hebrew spirit as are of value to us to-day. No critical scholar could be less concerned with the minutiæ of criticism: the casuistical spirit has certainly not infected him. Therein lies part of the charm of the book, that, though it rests upon an accurate knowledge of an overwhelming mass of detail, it keeps to the big things, the things of abiding value for life.

Christian readers will rise from this book with a new appreciation of the Rabbis and of their enormous literary output, which is too often glibly assessed by those who have never examined it. For the Rabbis, too, as Mr. Montefiore reminds us, 'had often their prophetic flashes and visions.' If in one aspect they were legalists, in another aspect they were humanists, and the latter aspect is persuasively presented in this book. Of no less interest are Mr. Montefiore's fine appreciations of Jesus, Paul, and the New Testament generally, and there is much that is illuminating here. Of the Fatherhood of God we read: 'We certainly do not get in the Hebrew Bible any teacher speaking of God and to God as "Father," "my Father," "your Father," and "our Father," like the Jesus of Matthew. We do not get so habitual and concentrated a use from any Rabbi in the Talmud. And this habitual and concentrated use rightly produces upon us an impression. By it we are led to believe all the more in the truth of the doctrine on which it rests. We are moved by it to wish that we, too, could feel that doctrine, even as Jesus teaches that we ought to feel it; and that we, too, could order our lives in its light and by its strength.'

Mr. Montefiore succeeds in making even the remote and abstruse Philo interesting; and in the last chapter he shows very clearly how deeply Liberal Judaism is rooted in the Old Testament as interpreted by modern criticism, and what to-day it stands for. To it the Jews are not a nation, but a religious community, and Zion and Jerusalem are terms of purely spiritual significance. The bearing of this on the Balfour Declaration is obvious.

EMERGENT EVOLUTION.

The Gifford Lectures in the University of St. Andrews were delivered last year by Emeritus-Professor C. Lloyd Morgan. They are now before the public in book form with the title *Emergent Evolution* (Williams & Norgate; 15s. net). We feel that we are not likely to do justice to Professor Morgan's position until the second course of his lectures is also in our hands. The present volume by itself is brimful of interest and instruction, but we must confess to some doubt as to what precisely the lecturer is aiming at or how he proposes to get there. The book strikes us as rather a series of separate papers—each of them very interesting—than an architectonic whole. Thus, for example, the chapter on Relativity is one of the clearest and most helpful accounts of that doctrine that we have seen, but what precisely is its function in the Professor's argument we do not see. In

brief, the argument of the lectures is plain and simple. The modern doctrine of evolution with its '*emergences*' and '*nisus*' is explained, and the author holds that all this is perfectly compatible with a theistic view. No one is likely to deny that. It has never been denied. The crassest 'naturalism' never did more than say that the conception of God was unnecessary. So far as we can see, Professor Morgan has no answer to that view. He himself prefers the theistic position, but that is all he can say. He does indeed think that by accepting God we attain 'a richer attitude of piety,' but that comes perilously near being a matter of taste. He will cherish no antagonism to anybody. 'There is not even the alternative "this" or "that." The alternative is, this world without God or the world, just as it is, but none the less dependent on God.' How this gets rid of the most fundamental of all antagonisms we fail to see.

THE MORAL LIFE OF THE HEBREWS.

A scientific study in English of the ethics of the ancient Hebrew world has for some time been overdue; we have it now in *The Moral Life of the Hebrews* (University of Chicago Press; $2.25 net), from the competent pen of Professor J. M. P. Smith, of Chicago. In this carefully written book, whose argument is abundantly lucid, as every paragraph of it is numbered and appropriately titled, Professor Smith traces through successive periods, from pre-prophetic times to the second century B.C., the moral practices and ideals of the Hebrews. This study rests upon a clear appreciation of the literary history, though limits of space prevent the writer from dealing at much length with the social and economic conditions which inevitably affect the ethical development of a people. With entire scientific candour he unbares the crudities of the earlier period, some of which persisted more or less to the end: but the long story, whose ethics almost throughout have a more or less utilitarian tinge, discloses an ever-deepening appreciation of goodness.

There are many points of incidental interest. Professor Smith here again maintains the thesis he has advanced and defended in earlier books, that 'Hosea felt himself called upon by Yahweh to marry a notoriously bad woman and accordingly did so.' The 'wicked' in the Psalms he thinks to be on the whole idolatrous fellow-Jews rather than pagans, and happily adduces the evidence of the Elephantine papyri in favour of this possibility. He presents a valuable discussion of the Servant of Yahweh problem in Deutero-Isaiah, suggesting that that great prophet is making use of the old idea of solidarity, but that he has purified and extended it to embrace the whole world. In the Book of Job he finds no trace of an expectation of vindication in a life beyond death. 'The splendour of Job's position lies in the fact that he remains true to himself and faithful to his ideals though he sees no solution to his problems, either in this life or in another.' The discussion of the Sages includes Ecclesiasticus as well as Proverbs. To most readers the most interesting chapter will be that on 'The Morals of the Egyptian Jews,' which gathers up from the Aramaic papyri discovered nearly twenty years ago the moral aspects of the Jewish-Egyptian life of the fifth century B.C., and presents them in a vivid way. The book is an adequate and valuable sketch of the moral development of the Hebrews.

A NEW BOOK ON ST. PAUL.

Professor F. G. Peabody of Harvard is well-known and highly valued in this country as the author of several books on the application of Christian principles to modern conditions, and perhaps even more, by preachers, for his suggestive meditations on texts in 'Mornings in the College Chapel.' He has now followed up his studies in the teaching of Jesus by an essay on Paul—*The Apostle Paul and the Modern World* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). Professor Peabody tells us that in the library of the Theological School at Harvard there are more than two thousand volumes dealing with Paul, but he justifies the addition of another on two grounds. One is that a great deal of light has recently been thrown on Paul's teaching by historical researches that were not primarily concerned with Paul at all, or even with Christianity, and the time has come to examine the bearing of this foreign material on Paul's teaching. Another reason is the attitude of the modern mind to religion. The attitude of mind to Jesus is that of admiring discipleship. He is the master of souls and not the source of dogma, claiming obedience rather than definition. But traditional orthodoxy is derived from the ideas of Paul, and especially from elements in him that cannot be regarded as permanent. And the problem to be faced in view

of these two facts is: in what light are we to regard this apostle? Did he absorb and transform the Hellenistic influences of his time, or did they produce in him a new type of Christianity? Was he a perverter of original Christianity, or its real founder? or simply, in spite of all, a loyal interpreter of Jesus Christ?

This is the problem Professor Peabody sets himself to solve in his new book. He endeavours to disentangle the timeless elements from the temporary, to detach the personality of Paul from the limitations of his environment, and to interpret the apostle in terms of the modern world. His plan is admirably simple, dealing in turn with 'The Man,' 'The Letters,' 'The Theology of Paul and the Modern World,' 'The Religion of Paul and the Modern World,' 'The Ethics of Paul and the Modern World,' and 'The Messenger and the Master.' It does not need to be said that the writer has mastered the wide literature of his subject or that his treatment is both fascinating and sincere. His book is not in any sense a strikingly original contribution, but it is full of good sense and marked by penetrating insight. It is inspired throughout by a genuine love of the Apostle and a sense of his greatness. And finally it does for the general reader an immense service. It shows how behind every important element in Paul's teaching there is a truth of permanent value. Some of the judgments in the book will be warmly disputed—his statement, *e.g.*, that for Paul Jesus was less than God. But these chapters will enrich the minds of students in many ways, and will (though the point of view is entirely modern) on the whole reassure them. It would not be easy to name any book better fitted to serve as an introduction to the study of Paul and Paulinism.

THE JESUS OF OUR FATHERS.

Those who occupy the extreme right wing of traditional orthodoxy have been asserting their position recently in various public ways. One of the criticisms passed on them by a well-known scholar in a lecture was that they produced no works of scholarship which would test the value of their views. There is one of them, however, who is not open to this charge. Dr. John W. Good, a Professor in the Georgia State College for Women, has written what is described by the publishers as a 'massive' work with the title *The Jesus of Our Fathers* (R.T.S.; 25s. net). 'The point of view of this monumental work,' we read on the cover, 'is the point of view of the plain man who devoutly believes that the divine nature of the Christ as the Son of God was made continually evident and positive from the annunciation to the crucifixion in the New Testament Scriptures.' This, however, does not do justice to the author for whom this truth of truths was made evident from the first page of Genesis. He occupies the standpoint of literal inspiration to which all the Bible is on one level and of equal value and authority. He knows the Bible thoroughly, and on the basis of his own view of it has written a study of the life and ministry of our Lord which is comprehensive and thorough. It has evidently been a labour of love, and it will prove helpful and instructive to those for whom the sufficient proof of a truth is that it is found written in the Word of God. The book reveals considerable ability and, what is better, a loyal devotion to the person of Christ.

THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY.

Mr. E. S. P. Haynes is still very unhappy; he is quite sure that the world has taken a wrong turn, and he cannot get it off his mind. In *The Enemies of Liberty* (Grant Richards; 6s. net) he returns to his complaint that, while we keep boasting of our liberty, in reality it is denied to us, and that what poor rags of it we have are being plucked away. For there are far too many fussy folk about, poking and prying into other people's business, regulating what is no affair of theirs, determined that those round about them must live not in accordance with the latter's own desires, but as they choose for them. Most of us, at times, have had an uneasy suspicion that something of that nature is uncomfortably true. But rarely, since Cain, can any one have cried out with such vehement protest that he is not his brother's keeper, as does Mr. Haynes, or asserted with such huge conviction that he will be obliged if other folk will kindly keep their hands off his concerns!

This is a frank and honest book, though probably these qualities do not cost Mr. Haynes very much. He is so sure that he is always right, and those who differ from him are sorry creatures. The picture left upon the mind is that of a sturdy figure settled squarely before the centre of the fire, laying down the law on every topic as it rises, with a raised and emphatic finger, talking much sound common sense, and much else with the same assurance, and

frequently mistaking prejudice for principle. And it is all rapped out with a hearty vigour and in terse vivid sentences. 'The typical modern Englishman,' he remarks, 'is too insensitive even to put cayenne pepper into his claret. He prefers methylated spirits.' There is a good dash of methylated spirits in this book.

THE MINISTER IN THE MODERN WORLD.

Is there any subject upon which more lectures have been given than the subject of preaching, and can there possibly be anything left for the gleaner in a field where so many giant reapers have toiled? Recent lecturers have felt driven into the byways, and in their desire for freshness of treatment they have failed sometimes, with all their brilliance, to do justice to the greatness of their theme. No such criticism can apply to the latest addition to the literature of preaching.

The Minister in the Modern World, by Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L. (Black; 3s. 6d. net), though modest in appearance, is a really great book. It consists of ten lectures on such themes as the inherent difficulties of modern preaching, the technique of the sermon, the psychology of preacher and congregation, the message to the man outside the Church, etc. These lectures are full of Christian thinking, nobly expressed. The preacher is called to view life as Jesus did, in its 'fundamental solemnity.' To the average modern view 'the landscape of most souls looks rather flat, with few peaks and few abysses, either in fact or in possibility. Most sins seem drab and grey, neither scarlet nor crimson. Crises in the spiritual life, according to our habitual judgement, are rare, and calamities far from irretrievable. . . . It is an untrue view, which I fear is begotten of our desire for comfortableness and of our fear of tragedy.' Some ministers 'seem to desire to convey the impression that they are just investigators of sacred truth, and have not passed beyond the stage of experiment. They give the impression that they would be ashamed to be known as the agents of a great rescue.' 'We must possess, perhaps I should say recapture, the note of urgency, spiritual and moral urgency. . . . The Bible is a book of urgency, haunted with the memory of moral tragedy and lit with the ardours of spiritual struggle.'

The subject of 'the minister as confidant and counsellor' is handled with rare wisdom and illustrated with incidents drawn from a wide and ripe experience.

There is an interesting note on Paulinism. 'A brilliant scholar, responsible for the theological reviewing in the most trustworthy paper for reviews of books, said to me two years ago, "The next movement in theological thinking will be a restudy of Paulinism." He went on to say, "Nothing would do so much to promote a spiritual revival in our nation as for a man to arise who could expound what St. Paul meant by Justification by faith in terms such as the modern mind could understand."' These words are curiously reminiscent of a sentence which appeared in the *Times* Literary Supplement: 'Who can tell whether the coming revival of religion so confidently predicted in certain quarters may not be waiting for the time when we are able to respond more vigorously to the presentation of the Gospel most intimately associated with St. Paul?'

Dr. Gillie's lectures will stand comparison with the very best that has been done in this field, and the Christian minister will find in them real inspiration.

A FAMOUS HERESY CASE.

The Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D., has devoted his skilled and fertile pen to a history of the 'Fergus Ferguson Case' in the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and he has produced a book of fascinating interest—*Fergus Ferguson, D.D., His Theology and Heresy Trial: A Chapter in Scottish Church History* (T. & T. Clark; 8s.). Many Scottish churchmen who have passed middle age will remember vaguely that there was such a case, and recall it as one of the minor disturbances of the ecclesiastical waters. It is not even mentioned in the biographies of Principal Rainy and Professor Robertson Smith, and one learns with surprise that Robertson Smith and Fergus Ferguson were tried in the same year. But Dr. Leckie successfully vindicates the importance of the Ferguson trial and its real place in the development of Scottish theological thought. For one thing, this was the first discussion in a Scottish Church Court of eschatological problems of a serious kind. But it was also the first definite challenge in the same quarter to the entire Calvinistic statement of Christian doctrine. And in both these respects the case had a fruitful influence on the forces which

were at work in leading the Scottish mind to a broader and more tolerant attitude in matters of doctrine. The Robertson Smith case had a more resounding fame, but it dealt with the issues and claims of Biblical criticism. The Ferguson case went deeper into the citadel of faith, and its results were at least as decisive. Few men in Scotland are more competent to describe the history and implications of such an event than Dr. Leckie, and he has written a book which will take an important place in the literature of Scottish Church life and thought.

THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF RELIGION.

Origin and Evolution of Religion, by Professor E. Washburn Hopkins of Yale (London: Humphrey Milford; 15s. net), is an excellent, we are almost tempted to say an important, book. It is a sound and scholarly work which may be trusted. The Professor evidently has thorough knowledge of his subject and all the most recent contributions of any importance that have been made to it. Only two points strike us as in any degree unsatisfying. We miss anything like adequate appreciation of the importance of a study of Prayer. The only reference to Prayer in a very full index is to one passage on prayers to the dead. Professor Hopkins is not alone in this strange neglect of the most universal manifestation of religion. Again, while we are grateful to him for so clearly and cogently showing up the fallacy of confusing a mere triad of deities with a real trinity, we are not quite persuaded that he has proved his case in exhibiting genuine trinities in Hinduism and Buddhism.

A book of a unique kind has been written on the relationships between war experiences and psychological theory. The writer is the Rev. W. N. Maxwell, M.A., and the title *A Psychological Retrospect of the Great War* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). Mr. Maxwell was a chaplain on active service, and gathered a rich harvest of experience among men of all ranks. He is also a competent psychologist, a follower of Dr. M'Dougall, and therefore a 'behaviourist,' not of the American school, but of one with a more 'spiritual' standpoint. His purpose in this book is twofold. He offers a reasoned explanation of the reactions of which men were conscious in the environment of war and which they carried with them into peace conditions. And, further, he exhibits the War as a great educational experience, the results of which are still being felt. The general thesis of the book is that the conduct of men was due to certain instinctive forces, and this is illustrated in successive chapters on The War Impulse, on Sentiment at the Front, on the Herd Instinct, and Courage. The discussion is illuminated by many actual incidents, and interesting pages are to be found on such points as the effect of war conditions on the religious life and the influence which the War has had on the post-war conduct of returned soldiers. The book is an able and original contribution in a little occupied field.

Dr. Joyce Oramel Hertzler has a hospitable mind, but a sense of proportion has been rather markedly denied it. Whether it is altogether seemly to include Jesus Christ at all in *The History of Utopian Thought* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) is a matter of taste upon which minds may differ, though it involves the reader in the difficulty of not being sure whether He is to be included in the very free criticisms of the Utopians among whom He is given a place; but in any case to dismiss Him in eighteen pages, and Plato in a couple or so more, while Bellamy's 'Looking Backward' is allowed ten; to give the same space to Mr. Wells and Augustine, and such like things,—all that is surely proof of an odd standard of values, or rather none at all. Moreover, there is an obviousness about much of the more original section of the work which stumbles one. To have paragraphs beginning 'The Utopians are naturally also *critics of their age*,' and 'The Utopians also *have a commendable faith*,' with these trite remarks printed in italics, is not impressive. But there are better things than that in the book, which is a handy volume, with reading behind it, and not a little useful information set down in a convenient form.

In *Meditations from the Old Testament* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net), Miss K. W. Cohen has made a happy selection of verses, chiefly from the Psalter, which she has so connected and arranged under appropriate heads that they are well fitted to convey to others the comfort and help they yielded to the compiler. She writes as an invalid to invalids.

In *Shakespeare's First Folio* (Blackwell; 4s. 6d.

net) Mr. R. Crompton Rhodes gives us a masterly piece of patient and thorough scholarship, in which, dealing fully and interestingly with every one—editor, printer, licenser, pirate—whose hands came into contact with the plays of Shakespeare, he proves incontrovertibly how inexpressibly much we owe to Heminge and Condell, the great dramatist's two fellow-actors, who, disgusted by the maimed and pirated editions of their dead friend's works that were being published, issued the First Folio, and thereby gave to posterity our glorious inheritance of the real Shakespeare. How immense is our debt to them may be gathered by comparing the great soliloquy as we know it with this, the version of it given in the Quarto of 1603:

'*To be, or not to be,* I there's the point.
To die, to sleepe, is that all? I all.
No, *to sleepe, to dreame.* I mary there it goes.
For in that dreame of death, when wee awake
And *borne* before an everlasting Iudge,
From whence *no passenger ever return'd,*
The undiscouered country, at whose sight
The happy smile, and the accurs'd damn'd.'

This text would seem to have been put together by the actor who played Marcellus, for in the scenes where he appears it is accurate; and for the rest he drew upon his memory, and his imagination, where that failed. It is a fair specimen of the sad stuff from which the two 'pious fellows' delivered us. And in view of that it seems but scanty justice that they should have been pursued all too often, not with a hot gratitude, but a grumbling nagging of querulous criticism. Mr. Rhodes meets these objections by his theory, which he seems to prove, that the good men were not editors in the accepted sense who altered their colleague's works, but that they published the various prompt-books of the plays where these existed, or, when these had disappeared, put the plays together from the actors' parts. It is time that the carping at their heels should cease, and they be given the meed of thanks and admiration that is their bare due. For, without them, Shakespeare had not been our Shakespeare.

Economics for Christians, by Mr. Joseph Clayton (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net), is an eloquent and well-informed plea for Christian Socialism. The chapters of the book were published as occasional essays in various papers, but they have a common purpose and a common conviction. The author, who is a Roman Catholic and a trade unionist, believes in the instinct for justice and goodwill in his fellow-men and appeals to this for a hearing. He believes that what ordinary Christians want is not goodwill but knowledge, and he provides this knowledge in his book. It is clearly written by a man who knows his subject and is all the more persuasive because he is fair and tolerant. Those who wish to know the case for a new industrial system based on co-operation and on production for social need will find that case stated here with sincerity and competence.

Nothing seems more difficult than to maintain the reticence of the Gospels in regard to the life after death. Our fathers painted the scenery of the eternal world after a fashion which they thought Biblical, and which doubtless satisfied their conceptions of the justice and mercy of God. To us many of the details of their picture are repulsive, so we hasten to cover our canvas with pleasanter scenery, forgetting that 'eye hath not seen nor ear heard.'

After Death, by Leslie D. Weatherhead (James Clarke; 5s. net), is a popular statement of the modern Christian view of life beyond the grave. The book, like so many others of the kind, took its rise amid the tragedies of the War. The writer has made himself familiar with the most recent literature on the subject, but his plough does not cut a very deep furrow, and he seems to lack somewhat of that sense of the awful mystery of death which imposes silence on more thoughtful minds. It is easy to say 'death will make so little difference that the scarcely-interrupted task of growing a soul will be continued'; but who knows? Following death comes an intermediate state, having two aspects, heaven and hell, both terminable. During this period the souls of the departed will have the fearful experience of watching their own past deeds working out consequences of good and evil in the generations that come after. If this be so, who may conceive the feelings of our first parents as they trace

the fruit
Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
Brought death into the World, and all our woe?

The purgatorial experiences of this heaven-hell state lead on to the consummation of the ages,

when probably all souls will attain a destiny of bliss. Of the conditions of life in this final phase the writer 'cannot even hazard a guess,' and here he quotes the familiar lines of Richard Baxter :

> My knowledge of that life is small,
> The eye of faith is dim ;
> But 'tis enough that Christ knows all,
> And I shall be with Him.

One feels it had been better to have quoted these lines in their true connexion, as referring to the whole state after death, though that would have grievously shortened this book.

While there is much dubious speculation, the earnest Christian spirit of the writer is apparent throughout, his style is pleasing, and readers will find much that he has written both satisfying and comforting.

The Headmaster of Shaw Street Public School, Greenock, delivered a number of short addresses to boys and girls in Wellpark U.F. Sabbath School. These have now been published by James Clarke & Co. with the title *The Hidden Word* (3s. 6d. net). The introduction to the volume has been written by Professor Adams.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales has published three interesting booklets on Milton. *John Milton, Puritan, Patriot, Poet* (9d. net), is a very readable sketch of the career and works of Milton. It is arranged in a form suitable for Study Circles, and is admirably adapted for its purpose. The other booklets are *Master John Milton of the Citie of London*, by M'Ewan Lawson (6d. net), and *Scenes from the Life of John Milton*, by Professor Price and Miss Byles (1s. net). The latter is in the form of a play.

The State Murder of John Griffiths, by Mr. H. Bodell Smith (Daniel ; 1s. net), is a reasoned if passionate plea for the abolition of capital punishment, somewhat one-sided in its outlook, and not too surefooted in exegesis, but sane and readable. The most interesting argument is probably his concern for those upon the other side, of which we make a Botany Bay by dumping our criminals ; for doubtless they run amok yonder as they did here ! The author conceives that each of us wakens up after death much what we were and in a similar environment to this we know. This is his ingenious answer to the argument that capital punishment is needed to keep down crime.

There is no more prolific pen engaged on the New Testament at present than that of Professor A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D., of Louisville, Ky. His famous 'Grammar of the Greek New Testament' was almost sufficient to have occupied one man for a lifetime, but since it appeared book after book has come from him. The latest is a popular handbook on the Second Gospel : *Studies in Mark's Gospel* (Doran ; $1.00 net). It is not a commentary or an exposition, but a series of essays in a popular vein on such topics as 'Mark's Gospel and the Synoptic Problem,' 'The Christ of Mark's Gospel,' 'The Teaching of Jesus in Mark's Gospel.' They are all quite good for their own purpose, which is to popularize the results of scholarship. The chapter on 'Peter's Influence on Mark's Gospel' would have been better if the writer had re-read Dr. Denney's page on the subject in 'Jesus and the Gospel.' But the book as a whole will be found interesting and useful.

The Rev. H. Schumacher, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Catholic University of America, has published the third volume of his *Handbook of Scripture Study* (Herder ; 8s. 6d.). It is a most comprehensive index, so to speak, of the problems that meet one in the reading of the New Testament. Questions of date, authorship, authenticity, and the like, as also difficulties raised by particular passages, all are dealt with, the various views concerning them summarized, and the authorities given. There is an astonishing mass of stuff packed into these pages.

Every scholar knows that in Gn 49, as in Dt 33, we have characterizations of the tribes rather than of the supposed individual progenitors of those tribes. Rev. Thomas Tully, M.A., while recognizing this, has, in *The Sons of Jacob and their Tribal Blessings* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net), claimed the preacher's right to treat the separate sayings of Gn 49 as character studies. He deftly handles the various types—the comfort-loving Issachar, the adventurous Zebulun—and makes us feel how modern they are. Mr. Tully must have convinced those who heard these Sunday afternoon addresses that the days of Genesis are not yet over.

Over commentator and translator alike the Book

of Job exercises a perpetual fascination; and Principal A. H. Mumford, B.D., in *The Book of Job: A Metrical Version* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), offers a translation in varying metres adapted to the changing moods and arguments of the discussion. Much of the verse is really musical and runs along with great ease and naturalness. This is all the more remarkable, as Principal Mumford has, throughout most of the book, set himself the almost inconceivably difficult task of writing a rhymed translation. Under such conditions exact accuracy has, at certain points, inevitably to be sacrificed, but there are genuine compensations in the pleasant and melodious lines which abound on every page. Later additions to the Book, such as the Elihu speeches, are removed to the end, so that we have in this translation a real approximation to the original book, both in its dramatic development and in its music. Here is the Principal's version of 38^{8-11}:

Who shut up the sea within doors when, like to a
babe at the birth,
It burst full-born from the depth and broke from
the womb of earth,
When naked it came to the light and I cradled it
in the land,
And I spun the mist for its vesture and the cloud
for a swaddling band,
When I broke the coast for its door-ways, when I
barred its advances and said:
Hitherto shalt thou come and no further, and here
shall thy proud waves be stayed?

Professor Peake has written a profoundly interesting introduction on the Significance of the Book of Job: introduction and translation alike will be welcomed by all who love and who desire to understand one of the greatest books of the world.

There are several good histories of the Hebrew people, and one or two of Old Testament Literature. The distinctive feature of Professor I. G. Matthews' *Old Testament Life and Literature* (Macmillan; 12s. net) is that in it those two interests are skilfully blended, and we are made to see how the literature runs *pari passu* with the political development. The book is written on the basis of the assured results of criticism, and is in all respects thoroughly up to date, in some points even advanced, Ezra being placed, for example, after Nehemiah, somewhere about 398 B.C. The story is carried from the days of ancient Babylon and Egypt down to 135 B.C., and it conveys a vivid impression of the Hebrew men and movements, as interpreted by sane criticism. The value of the book is considerably enhanced by an elaborate chronological chart, illustrative of Hebrew political and literary history and of contemporary history in the Oriental world.

We are unfortunately becoming accustomed to the anomaly, which so roused the wrath of Lord Tennyson, of priests of a religion who cannot read their own sacred books. The fact that the study of classical Greek has fallen from its former high estate has had a reflex adverse influence on the study of New Testament Greek. In these circumstances, Dr. J. Gresham Machen has done a notable service to the Church in publishing *New Testament Greek for Beginners* (Macmillan, New York; $2.20). The book is exactly what it professes to be. The author writes not as a scientific grammarian but as a teacher of long experience. The Grammar is admirably adapted for class use but will be equally useful to the private student. Difficulties are fairly faced; explanations are lucid; illustrations and vocabularies are plentiful. While the book assumes no previous knowledge of Greek, the ground is covered with sufficient thoroughness to give the student a real grip of the grammar. Throughout most of the exercises the author has wisely avoided quotations from the New Testament, as the reader's knowledge of the English text might give him a misleading impression of his knowledge of the Greek. The print, the spacing, the binding, and the whole appearance of the book are as attractive as the contents. In future editions, more frequent indications of the quantity of vowels would add to its usefulness.

Though the material of the book is some fifty years old, there is a topical interest in a small volume by the late Mrs. E. A. Finn, M.R.A.S., *Palestine Peasantry*, just published (Marshall Brothers; 1s. 6d.).

The object of the book, the material of which has been arranged mainly from articles which appeared in the 'Leisure Hour' many years ago, is to show that the lack of national unity among the people, their dense ignorance, and their very backward condition would make the grant to them of any measure of self-government a dangerous

experiment. The author points out that the Fellaheen, the agricultural peasantry, are broken up into clans which are antagonistic to each other, and endeavours to prove that these clans are the present-day descendants of the aboriginal tribes against whom the Israelites warred. In support of this theory she brings forward much evidence, the most interesting part of which is perhaps that in which she shows that many customs, expressly prohibited by the Mosaic Law, still exist as customs among the Fellaheen.

Church union is so much in the air that on all hands movements are taking shape for giving it practical fulfilment. In Canada the long-delayed consummation of a union between Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Wesleyans seems near at hand. Scottish Church union is now a certainty. The approach of Churches in England to one another is full of promise. In America, too, the subject is occupying a large place, and Dr. Newman Smyth, a leading Congregationalist, has just published a most interesting historical narrative of the inception, development, and present position of a movement, begun as far back as 1882 and continuing, with several checks, to grow towards the desired end. The story is rendered more instructive by the frank discussion of the present situation and the future prospects of the movement with which Dr. Smyth concludes his narrative. The title of his book is *A Story of Church Unity*: including the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops and the Congregational-Episcopal Approaches (Milford; 4s. 6d. net).

A collection of 200 Hymns for Students, with the Staff notation and also the Tonic Sol-fa notation, has been published by Mr. Humphrey Milford for 8d. net. It is the Student Christian Movement Edition. The title of *Hymns of the Kingdom* has been given to the collection.

A word in defence of the 'Fundamentalists' in America has been uttered, by whom, do you think? By Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale, one of the most scholarly of the modern school of critics! He has just published his 'James Wesley Cooper' Lecture on *The Teaching Ministry for To-morrow* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). He points out that 'Fundamentalism' is in essence a protest against the Liberalism that takes the soul out of the Gospel. Its error is in substituting an impossible view of the Bible and of dogma. The real answer to this irreligious liberalism is a demonstration that the modern view of the Bible is loyal to the gospel of Paul, and this demonstration ought to be given by the ministers of our churches. The lecture is an eloquent plea for a real teaching ministry, and ought to be widely circulated. Professor Bacon is both a Higher Critic and an Evangelical, and has earned the right to speak on his subject.

Proof of the Existence of God, by Mr. Charles Edward Pell (Palmer; 7s. 6d. net), is a good book to put into the hands of any one who is inclined to think that the sacred word 'evolution' has made the word 'God' almost unnecessary. It shows pungently how the dogmatic unbeliever in his account of Nature is constantly compelled to bring back the language of teleology and attribute to something which he calls 'nature' all the attributes of God. Then the author shows that such a view of evolution as makes progress depend on 'chance' variations is grotesquely untenable. He has an acute and clear mind and can say clearly what he means. His argument gives the impression of being irresistible, and as believers we agree with his conclusions. If, however, we were disposed to take the part of *advocatus diaboli*, we should say that the argument is a little too strong to be convincing. Mr. Pell scarcely does justice to the many modifications which the doctrine of evolution has undergone especially in recent years. He does not even mention, so far as we have noticed, the term 'emergence,' which has become so important. Nor does he seem to realize the real weakness of Paley's argument which he attempts to strengthen. Finally, we would say that the real task for faith to-day is to combat not the atheism but the pantheism to which some men of science are prone, and our author's argument does not apply there.

A collection of the shorter poems of Wordsworth has been made by Mr. John Hawke. The volume, bound attractively in green cloth, has been published by the Religious Tract Society at the very reasonable price of 2s. 6d. net. The title is *The Homeland Wordsworth*.

The story of *The Bible, and How It Came to Us*, often told before, is briefly but interestingly told again by Mr. F. G. Jannaway (Sampson Low;

1s. 6d. net), whose method is to begin with the Revised Version and to move backward till he reaches the ancient manuscripts, specimen pages of some of which are beautifully reproduced. The book is needlessly disfigured by foolish remarks about the Higher Critics, who are described as the enemies of Christ.

The Rev. Canon Sell, D.D., M.R.A.S., has brought out a fourth, enlarged, edition of *The Historical Development of the Qur'án* (Simpkin, Marshall; 6s. 6d. net). Everybody knows that the Suras are not given in their chronological order; and this treatise, in amending that, becomes an informing study of the prophet's mental history, and of the various phases through which he passed. Particularly telling is the record of his own deterioration in character, or that of the cooling of his friendliness towards Jew and Christian, till his original amity became intolerance. On the other hand, the sensual descriptions of Paradise are all early, and they were outgrown and left behind.

Work, Play, and the Gospel, by Malcolm Spencer, M.A. (Student Christian Movement; 4s. net), is a plea for a new evangelism to meet the needs of the present generation. The aim is admirable. It is 'not in any way to discredit the evangelist's aim of bringing individuals to a personal experience of God through Jesus Christ; it is rather to show that there are a thousand avenues by which the beginnings of that personal experience may be acquired.' The writer obviously has in his view the student world, whose lines have fallen unto them in pleasant places, who have been nursed in the lap of the Church, who have their books and their art, their tennis and their dances; and he strives to show how, through all of these, they may come into touch with Christ. It is a great thing to teach the young the naturalness and beauty of religion, but a one-sided presentation of truth may come dangerously near to error. Here games have a disproportionate value assigned to them in the religious education of the young. 'You can teach him to play himself right through the gateways into the Kingdom of God.' Sin and the sense of guilt are minimized. 'The modern need is typified by the boy who has made a sorry mess of his scoutmastership through thoughtlessness, or the girl who is disabled by her sense of instability and ineffectiveness.' Surely there are grimmer facts than these, even in the student world. A chapter is given to 'The Basal Elements of the Gospel,' in which Christ is presented as the ideal, without a hint that He died for the ungodly. It would not be unjust to say that the book is more an exposition of the Greek idea of culture than the Christian idea of redemption. As a protest against the narrowness of the older evangelism it is excellent, but it is confessedly not the whole Gospel; and whether it is a Gospel adequate to the needs of youth may be gravely doubted.

We have received from Messrs. Thomson & Cowan, Blythswood Square, Glasgow, a copy of their first publication. It is a short study of Hebrews xl. 24–27, by the Rev. T. N. Tattersall, the minister of Adelaide Place Baptist Church, Glasgow. The study is well worth publishing. The title is *The Man who refused a Kingdom.*

Meredith complained that the English people could not appreciate allegory. It may be largely the fault of the reader, but sometimes at least it is the fault of the allegory. Dr. Thomas Hall Shastid knows that if an allegory is to be read it must in the first place be interesting, and as readable as an ordinary romance. He has certainly succeeded in making his own attempt at an allegory readable. There is not a dull page in it. It conveys at the same time a good deal of accurate and interesting information. But as an allegory we do not like it. To begin with, Dr. Shastid takes a historical figure and makes him allegorical. Simon of Cyrene is treated as the representative of the Jewish race throughout its long history. Opinions may differ, but ours is that this is not wise. Then the story of the Jews is far too long to go into one volume of this kind. Also we have to express our astonishment that Dr. Shastid makes Simon come under Greek influence before he has reached Egypt! He warns us indeed not to read the book as a condensed history of the Jews, but this ignores chronology too completely. Further, we do not like Dr. Shastid's vocabulary in many places. Why write 'strook' for struck, or 'braken' for broken? In spite of such-like faults, it is a book that one will not lay aside easily. The title is *Simon of Cyrene, Dimachærus Splendens; or, The Story of a Man's (and a Nation's) Soul* (George Wahr).

The Reticence of God.

By the Reverend A. D. Belden, B.D., Westcliff-on-Sea.

There are few experiences of the human soul that present so sharp a test of character or are so apt to tempt one to bitterness as the experience of what is sometimes called the Silence of God. This experience is so common that it accounts perhaps more than anything else for the disappointment that so many people feel in regard to religion. They attempt for a while to lead a religious life, but find the element of Divine response so curiously lacking that they conclude either that there is nothing in it, or that if there is anything in it it is not for them. A better understanding of both the nature of God and of man might lead, however, to a very different conclusion.

(1) *The deserted Soul.*—The Hebrew Scriptures are interestingly frank in the presentation of this experience. One recalls Job's pathetic cry, 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!' or the bitter cry of the writer of the 88th Psalm, 'Lord, why castest thou off my soul? Why hidest thou thy face from me?' This is the cry of a soul that feels desperately the apparent unhelpfulness of God. For other men the arm of the Lord may have been made bare; Joseph and Moses and David and Elijah may have found the heavens opened and Divine succour poured forth, but for him the heavens are brass, God is silent and inactive—so silent and so inactive that the man feels forsaken. God has cast him off. God has hidden His face from him. And some who read these words will feel that this man speaks for them.

(2) *An elusive God.*—This reticence on God's part is presented in a variety of ways in other passages of the Old Testament. One of the most important instances is the story of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, the definite departure of God, as it seems to suggest, from a man's soul. There is the story of Elijah, who failed to discover God in the earthquake or in the fire, but found Him instead in that sound that was no sound, the sound of a gentle stillness. There is the exhortation of the prophet, 'Seek ye the Lord—while he may be found, Call ye upon him—while he is near,' the suggestion being that God has His absences, His times of concealment. There is the yearning cry of Ps 42, 'As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God.' God seems hard to come at. He is elusive. 'Oh that thou would'st rend the heavens and come down' is the appeal of a soul to whom God seems to be very far away. We all know occasions in life when we find in God this terrible reticence—times when it seems as though the world might use towards us Elijah's cruel taunt concerning Baal, 'Cry aloud . . . either he is musing, or he is gone aside, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked.'

(3) *Standing at the Door.*—In vivid comparison with this point of view we may set the attitude of the New Testament. Here, of course, God declares Himself in Christ entirely sensitive and responsive to human need. We may say, indeed, that the Old Testament is a record of man's cry for God. The New Testament is the record of God's answer. Yet it would be a careless reading of the New Testament which failed to detect that God's answer has in it an element of restraint. It is perhaps well represented in that little sentence put into the mouth of Jesus by the writer of Revelation, 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock.' God stands at the door of every life, but—He knocks. Yet this very reticence of God, the very difficulty that we have in realizing Him, is in a sense the very reason for the Gospel, it is the *raison d'être* of the Incarnation. Jesus came to 'declare' God. 'No man hath seen God at any time, but the only-begotten Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' In Christ, therefore, we ought to be able to discover a way in which this reticence may be overcome—overcome, that is, by being understood. Speech is silvern and silence is golden, and we have all known experiences in which silence has spoken, like action, louder than words; but it must be a silence that is understood. As we strive therefore to share the mind of Christ concerning God, we discover that there are three degrees in the Divine reticence.

(4) *Is God humble?*—There is first of all a *Divine reticence due to Divine character.* It will be perhaps quite a novel question for the reader to ask himself, but it is one well worth asking, for it takes us to the heart of the matter, 'Is God humble?' or, to

use a more daring word, though, of course, in its best sense, 'Is God shy?' We ought not to shrink from such a question in view of what we know of the character of Jesus, the meek and lowly of heart, who revealed a real dread of the acclamations of the crowd and the blatant popularity that His miracles might all too easily win for Him. 'Tell no man that I am the Christ.' He shows a love of indirectness, almost of disguise. 'Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth' is part of His teaching. 'Seek not the chief seats at the feast.' 'The first shall be last and the last first.' 'I am among you as one that serveth.' One is reminded, by the whole atmosphere that Jesus discloses, and discloses as a revelation of God, of that strong tradition concerning fairies which says that these exquisitely beautiful creatures are as shy as they are beautiful and flee from the gaze of the curious. They are said to show themselves only to children. They have a divine humility. One is reminded of certain words, 'Except ye become as children ye shall not see . . .' Is not this personal disinterestedness a fundamental demand of ours upon ideal character? Is it not, after all, the measure of the purity of life? In the best men it becomes painful. In God it becomes an ingenuity of indirectness.

(5) *By-productism.*—Is this why all the best things in the universe are by-products, as though God were determined never to be caught directly at work? When we see Him most vividly it is as a man, a carpenter, a Crucified. A friend of the writer was once walking with a very gifted theological professor, a man who knew God intimately, and as they walked they spoke of knowing and seeing God, when suddenly in a voice of tremulous enthusiasm and awe, the professor turned to my friend and exclaimed, clutching him by the arm, 'There! Did you see Him?' He was pointing to a girl who had picked a little boy out of the road on which he had fallen and was busy cleansing him of the mud and wiping his tears away. 'Did you see Him?'

As Evelyn Underhill has so beautifully sung:

I come in the little things,
Saith the Lord:
My starry wings
I do forsake,
Love's highway of humility to take;
Meekly I fit My stature to your need.
In beggar's part
About your gates I shall not cease to plead—
As man, to speak with man—
Till by such art
I shall achieve My Immemorial Plan,
Pass the low lintel of the human heart.

This is the first reason for God's reticence. He is reticent as Christ was reticent, because true love is always humble and does not force its way. Why are we so slow to take Jesus as the truth about God? This means, of course, that, like Elijah, we shall do well to look for God not in the big things such as thunder and earthquake and fire. These things are too obvious, and scarcely subtle enough for His work.

And His that gentle voice we hear,
Soft as the breath of even,
That checks each fault, that calms each fear,
And speaks of heaven.

(6) *The Room-maker.*—The second degree of Divine reticence that we may distinguish is that which is dictated by *reverence for human personality*. Strictly speaking, this is the reason of the former. The explanation of God's humility is to be found in His purpose for man. As the Psalmist exclaims, 'Thy gentleness (restraint) hath made me great.' There is no more vital necessity for the development of human character than the provision of an area of life in which that character can exercise itself in responsibility. Why is it that the son of a man of genius is so often a fool? The answer is very simple. The genius keeps all the ground, spreads himself over the whole situation. By his very brilliance he blinds his child, by his very greatness dwarfs him. He overcrowds surrounding personalities. God is too great a father, too perfect a genius, to behave thus. As Browning says, 'He leaves room for the newly-made to live.' 'So speak ye, and so do,' cries the Apostle James, 'as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.' As a child grows a wise parent retreats, helps less rather than more, and even then mainly by invitation. He becomes inevitably more reticent.

(7) *Use your own Resources.*—But when under certain very distinct conditions it is wise and safe to lay that reticence aside, *the communion that results is all the richer in meaning and in value for the previous restraint.* If God has not answered you, may it not be in order that you may open your eyes a little wider and look round a little more carefully? Like Abraham of old, you may find that the Lord has already provided—there is a ram caught in the thicket. God is silent, not in order

that you may fail of help, but that you may become bigger and stronger in the exercise of your gifts. He says, No, not because He has a grudge against you, but because He is so jealous for your best development. We find this reticence everywhere evident in the practice of Jesus. He does not heal without the fullest co-operation of those that appeal to Him. He is for ever thrusting responsibility upon the human soul. 'Go, and sin no more,' He says, suggesting that there was much more power for resisting temptation in that soul than that soul had hitherto believed. Possibly she had often weakly cried to God for strength whilst failing to rally her own will in loyalty to His command. What she needed to learn above all was her responsibility for her own condition. If God is reticent in your experience, ask yourself solemnly, Why is He silent? Is His silence but a form of counter-asking? Let me examine myself again. Where am I failing? Where am I lacking? Dare I accuse God of being insufficient for my needs whilst I am careless of my duty?

(8) *God's enforced Silences.*—A final consideration in regard to this great matter is that there is *a Divine reticence forced upon God by human unworthiness and sin.* This, of course, has been already hinted at in the foregoing, but it needs to be stated more strongly. It is possible for whole religious communities, indeed for the trend of a whole religion, to become so intrinsically false that God cannot give Himself spiritually to it. That little sentence previously quoted, 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock,' it is worth remembering, was addressed not only to the individual, but to the church of Laodicea, a church that was double-minded, neither hot nor cold, centred in itself, prostituted to the service of the world. In a very terrible picture by one of our great artists this situation has been drawn with great and vivid power. Before a massive temple of glorious architecture—with its doors fast shut, and upon which He knocks in vain, is a figure bowed with anguish, crowned with thorns. It is the Crucified! Even in Christianity it is terribly possible for the situation in which Jesus found Himself in regard to the Pharisees to be repeated. 'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me.' 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, how oft would I have gathered you as a hen gathereth her chickens beneath her wing, and ye would not.'

Are we obeying Christ? Is the modern Church right socially? Is she a plain demonstration in actual life and conduct of the laws that should govern the Kingdom of God? If not, how can God be fully revealed in her? 'If a man love me, he will keep my commandments; and we will love him, and will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' God must yearn for free and open and full relationship with His human children. He has nothing to fear from hearts as humble as His own, as passionately set upon service as Himself, whose natures are ever seeking to reflect His own. But if He is to come, such room must be made for Him. The Lord of forgiveness must find for dwelling-place a heart that itself forgives. 'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall receive mercy.'

Is this why God is as yet so unreal in our modern world, in our churches, in us? Do not these considerations give us furiously to think? No wonder Jesus began His preaching with the cry, 'The kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel.'

Jesus' Thought of Prayer.

By the Reverend J. M. Shaw, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

I.

One of the most striking things about Jesus' teaching as recorded in the Gospels is the literally unlimited possibilities assigned in it to believing prayer. Take, for example, that saying of His recorded in each of the first three Gospels, and in different contexts: 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.'

We are apt to dismiss such a saying as mere

rhetoric or hyperbole. Jesus, we say, was using a familiar figure or metaphor to express truth in a picturesque and striking way, after Oriental fashion. But this is too facile an explanation, for merely to leave it at this is to miss the ground-thought back of this and such-like sayings of the Master. No; the explanation has to be found in Jesus' whole view of God and the universe. The thought in Jesus' mind was this: that the world is at heart a moral and spiritual universe, 'My Father's'; brought into existence at the first and continued in existence, and energized by Divine redemptive energies, for the sake of the realization of Fatherly ends with His children. At the heart of this beating, pulsing world is a living, loving Heavenly Father, a controlling Fatherly Providence, actively at work in the world and free to operate even through the laws of the world—for what we call the 'laws of nature' are but the basal method of His providential working—for the realization of Fatherly purposes. Because of this, the man who dares to trust utterly in God has behind him the whole force of the universe. So that wherever we find a man linked with God the Father in unwavering faith or trust, there we have a power the possibilities of which are unlimited. This is why Jesus was always saying to His disciples, 'Have faith in God.' 'All things are possible to him who believes.' His view of God and of faith belong together; the one is the proper correlative of the other.

II.

Such a faith or trust in God was the central thing in Jesus' own life, and the secret of His wonderful character and work. It was the explanation, in particular, of what we call His 'miracles.' These we are apt to account for by the fact that He was the Son of God, and, as such, exercised Divine power for the accomplishment of His purposes. But not so did Jesus Himself represent the case. He traced all back to His unwavering faith and trust in God the Father. 'The Father . . . he doeth the works.' The uniqueness of His working, on His own representation, was due to the uniqueness of His faith. See Him, for example, and most strikingly, in contact with death: receiving the news of the fatal ending of the sickness of Jairus' daughter whom He was on the way to heal, yet going on in the face of the news, undismayed and undaunted, believing that God was able, in answer to prayer, to raise her from the dead; or meeting the funeral procession of the widow of Nain's son and stopping it, nothing doubting that God could bring back the boy to life; or, most striking of all, going out to the tomb of the buried Lazarus, commanding the friends to roll away the stone from the tomb, and, before the miracle actually took place, raising up His heart to God in thanksgiving for the answer that was to come to His prayer. More wonderful than the miracle itself in each case was the faith, the utter and absolute trust in God the Father, which made the miracle possible.

Such utter and unquestioning confidence in the power and willingness of God to answer prayer was a new thing, a new phenomenon, in human history. It was the perception of this that led the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, even after his great roll-call of the faithful under the Old Testament dispensation and the tracing of the secret of their lives to their faith in God, to go on in the following chapter to speak of Jesus as the 'beginner' or 'pioneer,' as Moffatt translates it, as well as the 'perfecter' of faith (He 12^2). What did he mean? He meant that Jesus made a new beginning in the life of faith. He blazed a new trail, so that in Him and in His faith there appeared a new thing in history. And when we ask what this new thing was, the answer is: It was His unlimited and unquestioning trust in omnipotent Father-love at the heart of things. For the first time in history there appeared on earth One who absolutely trusted the Fatherhood of God, One who, as Principal D. S. Cairns has expressed it, 'had utter confidence that Love was at the heart of things, utter confidence also in the Absolute Power of that Absolute Love and in the liberty of that Love to help Him.' Such faith and such prayer enabled God to act greatly; and whenever such faith and such prayer are exercised there, Jesus taught, we may expect on God's part an equally great response. For the law of the Father's working is this: 'According to your faith be it unto you.'

III.

Now, if we ask why this is the law of the Divine response, and why God thus conditions His working and the bestowal of His gifts on believing prayer, this again flows from His Fatherhood. So far from being strange or arbitrary, this is in line with God's method everywhere. It is, indeed, but one

illustration or exemplification of a universal principle of God's working, a principle or law which may be stated thus: That God conditions the bestowal of His blessings on the co-operation or working along with Him of His children.

It is so in the natural world. God conditions the bestowal of the 'gifts of nature' on our co-operation, so that the earth will not yield its harvest without man's labour. It is so, too, in the intellectual world; in the field of scientific discovery, for example. God does not publish abroad His truth in the sky, so that we have but to open our eyes to see it. Only when we give ourselves to intellectual toil do we give God the chance to reveal to us the knowledge of His laws for our own and others' benefit. This is wherein consists the chief responsibility of our gifts or talents. 'If my hand slacked, I should rob God.' And what is true in the natural sphere and in the intellectual is most of all true in the moral and spiritual sphere. Here, above all, God conditions the bestowal of His blessings on man's co-operation in faith and prayer.[1] Just as in the natural world, unless men work, God will not bestow His material blessings; and as in the intellectual world, unless men think, God will not bestow His blessings of truth: so in the moral and spiritual world, unless men pray, God is hindered in the bestowal of His greatest gifts and in the realization of His deepest purposes.

And if we ask why this is so, the answer is that it is not because of any unwillingness or lack of willingness on God's side, as if through our entreaties we could turn Him to a better mind. That, said Jesus, is a pagan or sub-Christian view of prayer. 'They think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.' Rather it comes of God's very Fatherliness, and of the greatness of His Fatherly purposes for His children. For a fundamental consideration in this matter of prayer, as in all God's dealings with His children, is that God, being the kind of Father He is, is more concerned for His children's good than for their pleasure, for His children's character than for their immediate comfort. If in the natural world God gave the material blessings of life without man having to work for them, where were the opportunity for the development of the physical side of his being? If in the intellectual world God revealed the blessings of truth without man having actively and energetically to think and investigate, where were the opportunity for the development of the intellectual side of his being? So, in the moral and spiritual world, if God bestowed His blessings on ourselves and others without our having to pray for them, where were the opportunity for the development of character—in particular, of that childlike faith and trust and surrender which, after all, is the fundamental condition of glorifying God and doing true service to our fellow-men? It is not that prayer changes God's mind and will, or turns Him to a greater willingness to bless; it is rather that prayer provides the conditions which give God the opportunity to realize His willingness and to bestow His gifts in such a way as that, when received, they shall be used for His glory and for our own and others' good.

So it comes to this: Prayer truly conceived in terms of Jesus' thinking is *the opening of our lives to a Father-God, so that He may have the opportunity to realize His will and purposes in and through us.* It is the means, not of trying to get from God what we want, but of enabling God to give us what He wants. 'Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him. After this manner, therefore, pray ye . . .'

[1] This is very helpfully worked out in H. E. Fosdick, *The Meaning of Prayer*, ch. iv.

In the Study.

A Prayer.

O God our Father, Who hast made us, and Who knowest how these frail hearts of ours are caught and held by every vivid trifle, how in the dust and din and bustle of our crowded days we are jostled far away from Thee, how half a hundred clamorous nothings to which we must attend fill our small minds and leave no room in them for Thee, now that, escaped for a little from the roar and noise of the world, with a thick door swung between us and our usual distractions, we can have a breath-

ing space, can sit in stillness, and have time to think, and to be cool, and to recall Thee to our minds again, be pleased in Thy great kindliness to heal the fever and the fretting of our souls, to take from us all that offends Thy holy eyes, that being pure in heart we may see God. Make Thyself real to us, so near and real that we cannot but recognize Thy Presence with us. And being in it, knowing ourselves face to face with Thee, may we not fill the holy place with a babble of our vain talk and our own foolish desires; but, bowed in reverence, wait with hushed hearts for Thy voice to us. Speak, Lord, for Thy servants hear.

Virginibus Puerisque.

How to be Happy.[1]

'The time of the singing of birds is come.'—Ca 2^{12}.

It's a great time when the birds come back, and the summer is full of their happiness and singing! They are game little fellows, aren't they, who start the day in great heart and the best of spirits, as you do yourself, you who waken up all of a piece and altogether! One moment you are fast asleep and the next you are bolt upright, with your eyes quite round and big and wide and never a sign of sleep in them: this second you are sound as sound can be, and in a trice you are tootling on that trumpet, or already you have dragged your favourite tattered book from under your pillow and are crawling over Daddy in his bed, thumping him hard, and crying, 'Read to me!' And he, who only wakens bit by bit, beginning at his toes and reaching his head last, growls and grunts, and opening half an eye tries to read with that, for indeed he knows the story pretty well by now—though if he makes the least mistake you always catch him—and keeps the other one and a half eyes tight shut and tries to sleep with them! But the birds are like you; as soon as they waken they are up and singing, you can hear them long before you rise. There's a blackie; and that's a thrush! And out on the moors the grouse are calling, 'Go back! Go back! Go back!' And there's another lovely waily kind of singer crying, 'Courlie, Courlie, Courlie!' Do you know his name? And the larks are winging up and up, and everybody near is standing still a moment to find and follow their wee bodies as they soar and soar. But none among them, so they tell us, can sing like the nightingale. The sparrows chatter and gossip and tell each other all the news and scandal; the starling—ah! he is very good at it; he will sit on a branch for long enough singing to his lady friend, 'Pretty girl! pretty girl! Dear! dear! Come away!' And there's another poor fellow—can you guess him?—whose wife has given him a very poor breakfast, and he can't get it off his mind; sits all day long saying to himself over and over, 'A little bit of bread and no cheese!' But there is none of them like the nightingale. And yet, the wise men tell us, the nightingale hasn't always got its lovely voice. When he is a young thing he doesn't sing; but only when he is mating, and when he and his wife are building the nest. It's slow work building nests, and she gets tired of it, and it's then he sings and sings his glorious songs to cheer her up. And when she is sitting on the eggs—that's very boring, days on days of it. You know, and you remember how you hated, that summer you were ill, having to lie in bed week after week; or you know when you have a long French exercise and can hear the click of the bats outside, how sick you get of having to stick in, and how inclined you feel to chuck it up and chance a row. Well! the nightingale gets weary like that; and it's then that her mate sings to her, sings on and on and on. And this is a queer thing, isn't it?—the very day the eggs are hatched, or almost so, he loses his glorious voice, he can't sing any longer, can only make a harsh, ugly, grating croak.

There is something for you to think about. It is when the nightingale is thinking, not of himself one little bit, but of somebody else, and trying to be nice to her and cheer her up and play the game, that he comes to his best and is happiest and sings just because everything is so glorious and jolly. You think that if you are to have a good time you must grab; and if there is something splendid you cry out, 'Take me! Me first!' That is the way to be happy you are sure, and to have a good time. But you're wrong! The nightingale is happiest when it's not thinking of itself at all; and if you could forget yourself, and what you want, and what you like, and would give mother a hand now and then instead of always choosing what seems better fun, and would let the little ones have a chance, not always make them do what you prefer, you would really be far happier than you are the other way. Selfishness is a mean cheat; it takes your money and then doesn't give you what it promised,

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

not the real thing. It's like the fellow, who after you had saved up ever so long sent you faked stamps; or the man who sold you a knife, and you saw at once it hadn't Sheffield on the blades, and said so, but he told you it was every bit as good; and it won't cut at all, was far worse than your old one in a day! Happiness is a queer thing; if you run after it, it's like the rainbow foot, you never reach it, though it always looks as if you were quite near. But if you forget about it, and think of other people, you will find it in your hands.

Look at the nightingale, and listen to him singing as nothing else can do, and all because he has clean forgotten about himself, and is trying to make others happy.

But why ever does he stop and lose his voice? I think perhaps it's partly his wife's fault! You see, at the start there was just him and her, and they were very much to one another. But when the wee ones came, there were so many of them, and they were such dears, that she rather forgot about him; or if she noticed him, was apt to scold and say, 'You haven't brought a worm for the last quarter of a minute! Why are you idling there? And what do you think a great hulking thing like you is for?' And he feels a little sad about it and stops singing. That's perhaps the way of it. And you had better think about that also. Mother, too, goes singing about the house, for she too is very happy. You are a cosy little nestful; and she loves you, and you love her; and it's all just as nice as nice can be. But if you were ever to forget her, she would stop singing and grow very sad. Forget about her! you cry, and you laugh at such a silly thing. For how could anybody forget mother? And yet other children had the nicest mother, so they thought, in all the world; and she too played with them, and worked for them, and tucked them in at night, and came to them at once all the way up the stairs whenever there was trouble, a tumble or a broken knee or a hurt finger to be mended, and they too loved her very much. But they've gone out into the world now, and they don't seem to remember her or anything about it. How horrid of them, do you say? It is; and yet, how often did you write your mother when you were away? Once! Only once! or not at all! What with the cows and the hens and the car, and the splendid time you had out in the country, had you no time for her? But that looks rather as if you too might forget about her by and by! And that will never do! If I were you I would give her an extra hug to-night when she comes round, an extra long and tight one, just to let her know that you'll never forget her, never, never, never!

And then there is this last thing worth thinking over. If anything goes wrong with the nightingale's nest just after the little birds are hatched, say the first day or the next, if a cat gets at them or something terrible like that, the nightingale gets back his voice. He starts, he and his wife, making another nest, and she sits on another set of eggs, and all the time he sings and sings as gloriously as ever. But if he has lost his voice for, say, a week before that cat comes prowling, then he doesn't get it back, and doesn't build another home, goes croaking harshly all the summer. And so you see if you are drifting into any ugly thing, you had better stop at once. You are a decent little chap, as straight as straight can be. At least you used to be so, but are you just quite as honest now, or at school are you beginning to shuffle a little? You used to be a really unselfish wee lass, but is that going! Take you care; you can perhaps do things like that once, or it may be twice, and stop them, but if you keep on doing them a very few times more you'll find you can't. The nightingale has lost its voice. To-day it can get it back, and probably it can still manage it to-morrow, but by the next day it can't. Take care, if you are ever going to get rid of that new, ugly thing, and be again the clean, honest, sunny little fellow that you were, then you must do it now.

Broadcasting.[1]

'A good man out of the good treasure of his heart *sendeth forth* good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure *sendeth forth* evil things.'—Mt 12^{35}.

Most people are interested in 'listening in,' and a great many, with bought sets, or home-made sets, are busy at it.

But 'broadcasting' comes first to give us something to listen to, and that is what I want to speak about.

How many broadcasting stations are there in Great Britain? You tell me 'six,' and perhaps you go on to tell me 'they are 5SC, 2LO, 2IT,' and so on. Well, I would like to say there are about forty-five million! Everybody is a broadcasting station, you and I, and every one. We

[1] By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

broadcast what Jesus calls 'idle words,' that is, the words we say without thinking, the words that just spill over out of the 'abundance of the heart,' the words that come out because the heart is full of them. We are not specially thinking what we say; they come out in fun, in anger, in chatter, and we don't think where they go or who hears them.

At one station the Children's Talk was being given, and it sounded as if the speaker loved the children and his task of speaking to them, but an 'idle word' spoilt it all. He finished up, 'Good-bye, my dear boys and girls. Shut off that wretched machine!' It was overheard.

Now Jesus says, 'A good man out of the fulness of his heart broadcasts good things, and an evil man, evil things.'

Let me show some of both sorts.

Once Jesus was praying to God. He wasn't thinking of His disciples. He was just letting the fulness of His heart overflow to His Father. But the disciples heard Him; and when He finished, they came and asked Him to teach them to pray.

Paul and Silas were once in prison, in an inner cell, sore from scourging, with their feet in the stocks. They weren't thinking about the other prisoners, and they sang praises to God, and the prisoners listened. They had never heard anything like that in prison before; groans, curses, and bitter complaints they had often heard, but not praises sung to God. Can't you imagine how it would set them thinking?

The poet Browning has a beautiful poem which tells of a day in the life of a little Italian mill-girl. It was her one holiday in the year, and as she went about she sang a happy song about God, because her heart was full of joy and God. Different people heard it, and the poem tells how it comforted some who were sad, and stopped from evil some who were sinful. Pippa never knew. She just broadcasted a good thing out of a good heart; and she goes to bed wondering if her life could ever touch the lives of those others to help. She didn't know that she had done it by her idle words.

Here is the other sort. Peter is standing by a fire in the courtyard of a house denying that he is a disciple of Jesus. He gets angry, and oaths and curses pour out broadcast. Then he sees Jesus looking at him. He realizes where his words have gone, and how they have hurt, and Peter rushes out weeping bitterly.

An English king is in France, and some news is brought to him that makes him furiously angry. Hot words burst from his lips. 'Will no one rid me of this troublesome priest?' The evil words fall on evil ears. Soon men are spurring on the road, and in a short while the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket, lies murdered in his cathedral, because King Henry broadcasted wild and angry words without thinking how far they would go and what harm they would do.

Sometimes a father checks his son for using some foolish phrase, and he gets the answer, 'I heard you saying it.'

Little boys listen to what the big boys say and copy it. Little girls listen to the big ones and do the same.

Take care what you are broadcasting. Our thoughts are our own, but after they are spoken they are out of our power to control.

'If I should *speak* thus,' says a wise old Psalmist, who was thinking very bitter things—'if I should *speak* thus, I would offend against the generation of thy children.'

If we have bitter thoughts, we must keep them to ourselves for the sake of others. It is not easy always to do it, for full hearts spill over. Therefore the best way is to ask God to keep our hearts, so that they be full of His love, and the things that are good and happy and kind. Then we will broadcast nothing that will hurt, and much that will make for happiness in this listening world, and we will not need to fear when God calls us to account for our idle words.

The Christian Year.

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

The Ministry of Restoration.

'Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness.'—Gal 6^1.

The recurrence of inconsistency and even scandal in the life of the Christian community is a disheartening incident which always has to be reckoned with. Perhaps we blame the methods of conversion for such mishaps. We say, on the one hand, that crude revival converts, subjected to extreme momentary excitement and imperfectly instructed, are sure to fail after a while. If, on the other hand, we are in sympathy with special revival movements, we are apt to blame the quieter methods through which people are gathered into

the Church, and assume that the nature has not been agitated and radically changed. Such pleas are irrelevant on whichever side they are used, for, as a matter of fact, the breakdowns come impartially and have no discernible connexion with the methods through which men and women are brought into the Church.

And so a ministry of restoration is necessary. It does two things. It makes for the protection and nurture of the weak; it also makes for our own spiritual perfecting.

1. *The ministry of restoration is necessary for the weak.*—The word 'brethren,' which introduces the appeal, strikes the keynote of the argument, for brethren cannot be made or unmade at will. The bond between us and those with whom we have had communion in the presence of our Lord is not ended by what may prove only a temporary aberration from the best standards of Christian conduct, however grievous and exasperating the lapse may be. Whilst any residuum of the truth which saves remains in the heart and conscience of those overtaken in a fault, we must recognize the obligation growing up out of our participation in the one bread and the one blood. Christian discipleship implies incorporation into the body of which Christ Jesus is the head, and he who falls into transgression has not lost the possibility of a revived adjustment to the sacred functions of that body. Bishop Lightfoot tells us that the Greek word for 'restore' means, in its primitive etymology, to set a bone or put back into its right place a dislocated joint. Now, whilst it may sometimes be a duty to the body to cut off a part in which actual mortification has set in, the readjustment where the condition is not obviously hopeless is a duty devolving upon those who have the necessary qualifications for the task.

Whilst this task is of urgent obligation, it is also immense in its difficulties, and demands qualifications of surpassing delicacy. To treat the fallen disciple as a common sinner may be accepted as a grave offence, and call forth the rage of wounded pride. He has lost, moreover, the temper which once helped him to bear rebuke, and indeed to welcome it, whilst he was a loyal member of the believing brotherhood, seeking honestly to know himself, and to press on after the highest spiritual perfection he could conceive. He is perhaps poised between self-justification and despair. He is intent upon maintaining his self-respect; and to do that he must blame the religion which has permitted him to fall. Harshness, unjust reproach, recrimination, any superior assumption on the part of the man who assumes the office of restorer, will do mischief rather than effect good. The Apostle singles out for the delicate and vital work of restoration those who are spiritual in temper and habit of mind, a qualification which lends itself to plain and simple tests. The spiritual man is one who, in his prevailing modes of thought and feeling, has become subdued and sensitive to the will of the all-surrounding Spirit of God. Spirituality arises not from a quality of temperament, but from a receptive habit of soul. The spiritual man is steeped in the fulness of the Divine life, and his dispositions are assimilated to those dispositions of gentle and tender helpfulness which have their home in God, and are conveyed by His Spirit to others. The Spirit puts His own impress upon the man who is designated to this Christlike work of readjustment and restoration. For to recover is in reality the work of the Divine Spirit Himself, and the Spirit seeks a spiritual man to be the instrument of it. No other qualification will avail for the great enterprise. If we would take part in the enterprise, we must cultivate spirituality—for spirituality is fitness.

2. *The ministry of restoration is necessary for our own spiritual perfecting*, and only those who are spiritually minded can undertake it.—The recovery of others is a motive to spirituality, and we shall be confirmed in the rarest attainments of the religious life by the work for which we fit ourselves. The Church is unspiritual where this work is undone, or pursued with but indifferent success. Moreover, strong motives are necessary to sustain a man in the task of recovering the fallen to their lost purity of faith and life, and such motives are found only amongst those who are deeply spiritual. These perceive what a tragedy it is for a man to lose his place in the spiritual order and to disappear from the providential sphere where such possibilities were within his reach.

Meekness is allied to spirituality, and there can be no effectual ministry to those who are estranged where there is a temper of wrath, pride, and spiritual superciliousness. The task must be begun, continued, and ended in the spirit of lowliness. The spiritual man is always humble, for he has learned his dependence on those inspirations which come down from God. It is his own sense of nothingness

which enables him to receive the subtle influences by which he is transformed and spiritualized. 'Considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.'

The highest spirituality is altruistic, for its genius constrains it to sympathy with those who fall, and a tireless endeavour to lift them up. That Church is not the most Christlike which is careful of its reputation and has an immaculate record, but the Church which risks even its own name in stretching out hands to the weak, and within which the spiritual find time and faculties absorbed in bringing back those who have gone astray. The genius of spirituality is practical. The function of the man who is possessed by the Divine Spirit and inspired with the Divine breath is to restore those who have been overtaken in offence and transgression.[1]

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Blessing.

'The good will of him that dwelt in the bush.'—Dt 33^{16}.

This is part of the blessing with which Moses blessed the children of Israel. He had brought them out of Egypt through the great and terrible wilderness to the borders of the Promised Land. In a few days they were to pass into the land, and take possession of it. But Moses himself was not to go with them; and so, before they parted, he bestowed his blessing upon them.

He blessed each of the tribes separately, calling them by the names of their ancestors, the sons of Jacob. These sons of Jacob had stamped their character upon their descendants, and Moses, who knew them so well, knew that God would work out His purposes in each case according to the lines of that character.

The finest of all the blessings is that pronounced upon the tribe of Joseph. For if the tribe of Joseph possessed the character of Joseph himself, and if their destiny was to be in accordance with it, they were fortunate indeed. If David is spoken of as the man after God's own heart, we might perhaps speak of Joseph as the man after man's own heart. Moses seems to have felt that. At any rate, it is a wonderfully beautiful blessing—that blessing with which he blessed the tribe of Joseph. It is full of beautiful phrases—'fruits brought forth by the sun,' 'the precious things of the earth and the fulness thereof,' and then it ends up most unexpectedly with 'the good will of him that dwelt in the bush.'

The old man's memory suddenly went back forty years. One event in his life stood out beyond all others—the event that called him to his life's work. One day in the wilderness he was arrested by the sight of a bush burning and not being consumed. And out of the midst of the bush a voice spoke to him. That voice was the voice of God, and the God who spoke to him in the bush had been with him throughout his whole life since that day. And now he had reached the end of the course. He had fought a good fight and finished the course. He had been tested by prosperity in Egypt and adversity in the wilderness, but through it all he had stood firm. This God had been his comfort and strength.

On that day on which he looked with amazement at a bush burning and not consumed, a new thing entered into his life which made all the difference to him. His spirit awoke that day to the knowledge of another Spirit. His will surrendered that day to a stronger Will. He became servant that day to a new Master—a Master who paid him with sufferings and trials without number, but whom nevertheless he had found it a delight to serve. And now, looking back over the forty years he had served Him, he feels that the best blessing he can bestow on any one is just this—'the good will of him that dwelt in the bush.'

What kind of a God was He?

1. For one thing, *He was tender and sympathetic.* His words to Moses were: 'I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows.' That is a God whose good will is worth having. It is a strange thing that, although God was spoken of in that way at the very beginning of their history, the Israelites never thought much of the sympathy of God and never had any real understanding of what it meant until Christ came. But when Christ came, that was the revelation above all others that He brought with Him. That was the very reason why Christ came into the world—because God had seen our afflictions and knew our sorrows. It was a tender, sympathetic God who had been with Moses all these forty years. We find just the same God in Jesus Christ. Have we realized how sympathetic

[1] T. G. Selby, *The Commonwealth of the Redeemed*, 154.

He is? The writers of the New Testament try ever so many ways to make us understand it. They speak of Him as having a fellow-feeling for our infirmities, and as having been tempted in all points like as we are. When the crowds came to listen to His preaching, Jesus thought of them as sheep without a shepherd and worried by dogs. And again and again we read that He had compassion on the multitude.

2. But there is another thing to notice about this God that dwelt in the bush. He is *a God that gives a man great tasks to do in life.* 'Come now,' He said to Moses, 'and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt.'

We are sometimes told to be satisfied with little things in life. There is a verse of one of our hymns which says:

> The trivial round, the common task,
> Will furnish all we ought to ask,
> Room to deny ourselves, a road
> To bring us daily nearer God.

There is a great truth expressed in that hymn—the truth that we may serve God well in carrying out faithfully the most ordinary duties of life. But there is a danger all the same of misapplying that thought. We are not to make it an excuse for remaining content with the common and easy duty if God calls us to an uncommon and difficult one. And He may call us more often than we think. The truth is, we do not want to be called to difficult tasks, and so we do not hear God's call when it comes. Moses would a thousand times rather have gone on keeping the flock of his father-in-law all his life long than have accepted God's call to go down into Egypt to deliver the Israelites. Let us look for the call of God in our own lives and let us take up the task He offers us, however hard it may seem.

3. For there is a third thing to be said about this God that dwelt in the bush: *If He calls you to a hard task He gives you strength for it.* He sends no man a-warring on his own charges. He promises 'as thy days so shall thy strength be.' More than that, He works along with us, giving us strength for the task by going with us to the discharge of it. Moses hesitated, as he well might, but God said, 'Surely I will be with thee.' That made all the difference. Moses had some idea of the difficulty of the work that lay before him, but its difficulty was far greater than he had any conception of. He had difficulty in persuading the Israelites to let him go to Pharaoh and ask for their deliverance. He had far more difficulty in persuading Pharaoh to let them go. But none of these difficulties was to be compared with the difficulty of leading them through the wilderness. We may say quite safely that but for God's presence with him he could not possibly have done it. And we must not think that men are different now from what they were then, or that God is different. If He puts us in some trying position or calls us to undertake some arduous work, He will be with us and carry us through. Remember Moses, who endured as seeing Him who is invisible. But certainly his life is worth remembering as that of a man who used all the powers that God had given him. And at the end of his life he could speak of this God as one whose good will was the highest blessing that any man could have.

Is not this true of our Lord yet? Whom has He failed? When has He broken His word? Who can say that he has gone to Him for strength and has not received it? Have we known any higher blessing than this of Moses—'the good will of him that dwelt in the bush'?

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Excellence of the Commonplace.

'But Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abanah and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them, and be clean? So he turned, and went away in a rage.'—2 K $5^{11.\ 12}$.

The irritation of Naaman is so natural that it hardly requires any words of explanation. We recognize in a moment what vexed him so, just because we have often been so vexed ourselves. Naaman expected a striking and startling cure. He knew how the Syrian magicians would conduct themselves. They would come forth in procession, muttering their incantations, and moving their hands in mysterious fashion over the sufferer. Something of this kind, no doubt, Naaman was expecting when he rode up in state to Elisha's door. Then came Elisha's message, 'Go and wash in Jordan.' Go and do something that any man could do. And it was all so commonplace—so ordinary—so utterly lacking in dramatic interest, that Naaman was intensely irritated.

1. Naaman was not alone in his irritation, for *the dislike of the commonplace is well-nigh universal.*

There is another Bible story where the same intense dislike makes itself manifest. 'Is not this the carpenter's son? Do we not know His brothers?' It was with such words that the Jews discredited Jesus. They were intensely irritated at the commonplaceness of this Messiah's advent. It was a prevalent belief of the Jews that the second Adam would come in full-grown manhood like the first. They had the convenient habit, which we all possess, of forgetting the prophecies they wanted to forget. Suddenly, in some epiphany of glory, perhaps from the secret of the Temple, Christ would appear. Then Christ was born in a little hillside village, and He was rocked in His cradle by His village mother, and He wrought with His father who was the village carpenter, and He played with His comrades in the village streets—and it was all so commonplace to unobservant eyes—so untouched with a single gleam of scenic splendour, that the Jews, like Naaman, were very angry, and went away from Christ Jesus in a rage.

But to come nearer home and think of ourselves—are we not all prone to the same irritation? Think, for example, of how we regard our newspapers. A man takes up his paper with a feeling of expectancy; he rarely lays it down without some disappointment. We say, There is nothing in the newspaper this morning—nothing—and so we throw it down. What we really mean is that there is nothing startling, nothing to thrill and hold us by its tragedy.

Is that faint vexation not akin to Naaman's when he was bidden by Elisha to go and wash in Jordan? Does it not indicate that it is very hard to realize the value of the ordinary? The fact is we are half-savage at the heart yet, and have never lost the savage delight in glaring colours.

Much, too, of the disappointment that unfolding life brings with it is connected by very real yet subtle ties with this deep-seated vexation at the commonplace. When we are young we all dream heroic dreams. We start from childhood, as Naaman did from Syria, not knowing anything, but seeing glorious visions; and we have all pictured in our schoolboy years what is going to happen when we meet Elisha. Then we, too, come to the borders of our manhood and our womanhood—we approach the threshold we have so often dreamed of in those days of the heroes when we were little children; but the pageantry we looked for and the glory we foresaw do not meet us any more than they met Naaman: like Naaman we are just bidden go and wash in Jordan. Our joys have nothing remarkable about them—they are just the joys of a thousand other homes. There is nothing spectacular about our sorrows—we can point to a score of hearts which have been torn like ours. We are not such geniuses as we once thought we were—matched with the great world we come to find our level—life is more ordinary, and far more commonplace, than we ever dreamed of in the golden morning. So springs one disappointment of maturity; so springs the temptation to innumerable sins. It almost seems as if the promise of life had cheated us—life has evolved so differently from our expectation. How many men turn away in a rage from life's plain duties not because they are difficult, but because they are dull![1]

2. *The dislike of the commonplace is dangerous.* It is dangerous first because the commonplace is the warp and woof of life. No inspired moments may have flashed out of a blue eternity into our soul to fire it to dazzling deeds that challenge the world's attention; deeds upon which we can look back with a perennial satisfaction that says: 'My soul, because of that bright exploit, thou hast not lived in vain!' There may have been in our experience no 'Crowded hour of glorious life' to make us feel that it is worth while to endure the plodding round for the sake of the occasional intoxication of soul that kindles the imagination and sets the pulse a-beating to the tune of a glad triumphal march; or to persuade us that, though our canopy be clouds, yet it is good to walk beneath them for hope of the golden brilliancy that will, ever and anon, stream through the murky mist and flood the world around us. We have not known these experiences, and may not expect to know them; a myriad million paltrinesses, a multitude of trivialities which no man can number, overtaking us with the dull mechanic regularity of clockwork, have commandeered our life, and spread it over with their drab monotony. Nevertheless, although

> To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
> Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
> To the last syllable of recorded time,

yet shall our faith prevail, nourishing itself upon the knowledge that our times are in the Father's

[1] G. H. Morrison, *The Unlighted Lustre*, 52.

hand, and that one day, He, in His marvellously tender skill, will gather up the loose threads of our purposes and the broken ends of our achievement and make them warp and woof of a luminous eternity.

A hope like that is an inspiration, but it must not be used as an opiate. There are monotonies in the lives of others for which it is our business to find a remedy. There are samenesses in our own lives where we must see not sameness but variety. He who says that the million blades of grass are all the same has surely never seen two blades of grass together; for the significant truth is that there are not two of them the same. With similar minuteness of unparalleled workmanship, the loving hand of the Ever-blessed has scattered His ministries of comfort, of joy, of beauty, of laughter, of faith, of hope, of love, over the stale monotonies of life, that whosoever will may behold and find them.

Goethe has pointed out in *Poetry and Truth* that all our comfort hinges upon the unfailing recurrence of the most ordinary phenomena, such as light and darkness, the flowers, the fruits, the seasons; and that it is only when we withdraw our natural interest from these that we begin to loathe our very existence and to find our days a burden.

The dislike of the commonplace is dangerous, in the second place, not only because it is the lot of most of us, but because it affords us our greatest opportunity.

'I remember,' says Mr. Graham,[1] 'having once, in the hearing of a farmer, expressed pity for the horses that were ploughing in a steep field. "Surely," I remarked, "if they have much of that to do, it will soon wear them out." "Oh no!" was his reply, "the horses that plough on the level wear out sooner than those that are put to the hilly lands; you see they are always using the same set of muscles." The easier job was the more trying work: it was a severer test of the animal. Perhaps in that may be found the explanation why the flats and fens of human life are such an ordeal; they keep the burden, as it were, upon the same set of spiritual muscles continually.'

It is not strange that when great occasions arise the man to fit the occasion should so frequently arrive along with it, as if by magic. It must be so: for it is less difficult to fit a great occasion than a small one, and more people can do it.

'The highest form of martyrdom,' as Mark Rutherford so wisely says, 'is not dying for a cause, it is not even living for the sake of a cause, but living without one, merely because it is your duty to live. If you are called upon to testify to a great truth it is easy to sing in flames. . . . The saints whom I would canonise are not martyrs to a cause, but those who have none.'

There is a song, familiar to us all, in which these lines occur:

'You'll tak' the high road, an' I'll tak' the low road,
And I'll be in Scotland afore ye.'

Now, some say that these words are an allegory, and that they speak of the 'Land o' the Leal.' If that be so, then they speak God's truth. For the low road to heaven, the road that runs through the valley of humiliation and the plains of penitence and the wilderness of trivial occupation, is a shorter and a surer way to that blessed land than the high road of ambitious and uncertain service.[2]

[1] J. K. Graham, *Anno Domini*, 156.

[2] *Ibid.* 160.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Reward of Well-doing.

'And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan's sake?'—2 S 9[1].

The part that Samuel the prophet played after a point in Saul's career—not uniformly either a wise or a just part—was enough to convince Jonathan that, whether the prophet spoke by the mouth of the Lord or only by his own, his partisan zeal in the interests of David had made his father's cause impossible. But should we wonder if Jonathan had made a determined stand for his own personal rights and the fortunes of his house? Out of a notable and almost matchless friendship he took the opposite course, and held himself ready to decrease, that the man who had taken his place might increase.

Because of his devotion to his rival he made his position intolerable at the court of his father the king, and after a bitterly chequered experience, while as yet the sun of his years was at its meridian, he fell on Gilboa, bravely doing his duty in what he knew was a lost cause. Whether or not he recognized a higher will in the fortunes of David, there is nothing in history more worthy to receive the homage of all time than the part which this man played in this ancient drama of a friendship which was without variableness or shadow of turning.

'And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan's sake?' We are glad to read this. Without question David was a man of fine spiritual perception, and he had a deep religious nature; but, even allowing for his day and his position, he had the defects of his qualities in a very pronounced form. We are the better, therefore, for knowing of his gratitude for a friendship which gave all for nothing, and that he showed it through one whom he could easily have overlooked.

This is the explanation of Mephibosheth at the royal table. This is the meaning of that rapid transition from Lo-debar to kings' houses. There had been a father who had not always looked to his own things, who had lived above, and away from, miserable aims that began and ended with himself. And because he had done good, hoping for nothing in return, among other things his afflicted, helpless, lonely son had come so far nearer to his own. 'Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days.' 'Give a portion to seven, also to eight, for thou knowest not what shall come after thee on the earth.'

With this incident in mind, let us take three things for consideration.

1. *The reward of doing good.*—Many people doubt, or they affect to doubt, whether there is such a thing in our human relations one to another as disinterested goodness; or if there be, which is hard to believe, to expect gratitude in return for doing good is to reveal ourselves either as very simple people or as decidedly too good for a world like this, with such natures as ours. Whatever may be said about rewards, it is a fact that the blessings of the Bible are always poured on right-doing. In the Beatitudes of Jesus there is not a single blessing pronounced on merely social pre-eminence and influence. Someone has very truly remarked that all the persons referred to in these golden sayings might be extinguished to-morrow, and the world of social importance would not, on the side of its importance, be conscious of any loss. And there is gratitude. How little we know about the source of our own riches! Some of us may be, many of us are, reaping to-day harvests which our fathers sowed in fields which seemed to promise so little of the fruits of gratitude. 'Years ago,' says Dr. Ambrose Shepherd,[1] 'a youth applied for a place in one of the great ironworks in the north of England. To his surprise, he received almost by return of post a kind note from the head of the firm asking him to call at his private residence. "Your father," said the gentleman to the lad when he called, "was ever too busy helping others to do much for himself. I cannot say how much I owe to the start he gave me, and to his counsel in the earlier stages of my business career; and for his sake it now depends upon yourself to what you will rise with us."' 'Give, and it shall be given you.' This is no impersonal word, said of some impersonal force. Jesus has taught us that God is our Father, and we rob the name of its meaning when we think of Him as so fettered by what we are pleased to call 'the general laws of His administration' as to be unable to keep His word and fulfil His promises. We must give to get; and no man does an unselfish thing and fails of the reward there is in the thing itself. 'Give, and it shall be given you.' The promise may be fulfilled in the reflex influence of unselfishness, in what has been finely called, 'the joy of doing good' or it may come back to us in kind, either in our outward fortunes or to some one closely bound up with our life.

2. *There is a good that is greater than reward.*—We have to admit that we do not always come to our own in this matter of gratitude. The Gospel lesson for to-day is the cleansing of the ten lepers. And it was after that cleansing that our Lord said, 'Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine?' Need we marvel if the experience of the servant in the matter of thanks is not very different from that of his Lord? Ingratitude is such a common fault. It is always breaking hearts. And yet it was for the men's sakes, because of what it augured in them, that the look of sadness spread over the Saviour's face, and He said, 'Where are the nine?'

In our work for others we must learn to do without gratitude. We do not know the secret of service until we have learned to do without it. It is to doing good we are called, not to thanks for doing it. And we are of no real use to God or man until, if not the joy, yet the imperatives of service swallow up the pain of the self-sacrifice we make, and convert our dependence upon thanks into the springs of a higher satisfaction.

3. *There is a good that is independent of reward.*—To do good hoping for nothing in return is not to say there is no return. What return can be more or greater than this: 'That ye may be the children

[1] Ambrose Shepherd, *Sermons*, 128.

of your Father which is in heaven'? 'God Almighty knows His mind about me,' said David Livingstone, 'and I am not going to trouble about that. His will is final, and good as it is final; and it is my business to find out by obedience what that mind is, and make it my own.' We should be less concerned to know that God is on our side. It is enough if we can be sure that we are on the side of God. Do not let us ask that our work should seem as well as be. Let us but have a good conscience over it, and be content even to see it fail—knowing that that is part of God's way of making it succeed.

Whosoever takes God's side, in so far as he works loyally for God, in so far as he works steadfastly without impatience for premature results, in so far as he works joyously in the liberty of the Spirit and not as the slave of his toil, for him victory in all things is set fast and secure. If we are saved ourselves, we are saved to serve; and nothing will prevail with men to-day but the love of an unselfish service, for that in us is the love of Christ which constraineth. We may not see the result to-day, nor yet to-morrow; but we shall see that it was every day and all the way as we look back upon it out of the white radiance of eternity.[1]

Cast your bread upon the waters, far and wide your treasure strew;
Scatter it with willing fingers, shout for joy to see it go;
You may think it lost for ever; but, as sure as God is true,
In this life, and in the other, it will yet return to you.

Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Neutrality.

'He that is not with me is against me.'—Mt 12^{30}.

Our Lord stood almost alone against all the religious, learned, and ruling classes of His nation; but, though standing thus alone, He made the tremendous claim: 'He that is not with me is against me.' In completest contrast with these words stands the claim of Socrates, the wisest of all the Greeks. Far from declaring himself the possessor of any final or even partial form of wisdom, he maintained that the point in which he excelled all other teachers was just this, that in the field of truth he knew his own ignorance and was conscious of his own limitations. And yet this young Prophet of Galilee, who never wrote a book, who taught only for three years, and by His teaching and life alienated the so-called wise and learned men of His own nation, who won only a few converts, and finally died a malefactor's death, used no words of idle assumption when He said: 'He that is not with me is against me.' History has shown in unmistakable terms the truth of these words. His life and teaching, as they reach ever wider and wider circles down the ages, have been steadily forcing individuals and nations alike to take thought and to take sides either for or against Him.

All that met Christ unconsciously fell into one of three classes. The first was composed of those that accepted and loved Him; the second, of those that rejected and hated Him; and the third, of those that neither loved nor hated Him, but took up an attitude of neutrality or indifference towards Him.

Such a division is at first sight an obvious and apparently a justifiable one, but is it a true one? Are there really three classes? When man is brought face to face with such claims, Christ declares that it is not. 'He that is not with me is against me,' He said.

1. The classes of His own day took sides. The record of Christ's short ministry of three years is at the same time a record of the growing hostility of His countrymen against Him. The priestly and learned classes early took sides against Him. This hostility was due to the radical antagonism existing between their character and teaching, and those of our Lord. Their character we know. Their teaching was essentially dogmatic. Christ, on the other hand, appealed to the conscience of His hearers and never required a blind acceptance of His words.

On the defection of the ruling and learned classes, there still remained the masses (especially in Galilee) that were attracted by His teaching. Amongst these there were two types easy to distinguish. The first was represented by the peasants of Galilee. These Galilean peasants were intensely patriotic; they were full of national prejudices, but were on the whole moral and religious, and formed the best and soundest part of the nation. They cherished ardent expectations of the Messiah, and accordingly welcomed the young Prophet with the wildest enthusiasm. At last they sought by force to make Him their king. Now, had our Lord lent Himself

[1] Ambrose Shepherd, *Sermons*, 124.

to their Messianic aspirations, He could easily have made Himself the master of all Palestine. But He refused to do so.

With a word He could have won the masses to His side. But He would not speak that word. And when, notwithstanding His refusal to become their king, some of the same multitudes still followed Him, He turned and set forth His claims in such severe terms that they forsook Him forthwith, and only a bewildered few still clung fast to their allegiance.

But Christ drew faithful disciples not only from the sturdy peasant class of Galilee. He found them also amongst the publicans and sinners—classes that philosophers had regarded as hopeless, and popular opinion had branded with infamy, and by its merciless attitude had hardened into a temper of callousness and despair. By His wondrous sympathy and His faith in the goodness still latent within them, He lifted them out of their despair and sin, and quickened them with the power of a new life. Here also sides were taken for and against Him in all those who came under His immediate influence.

2. This necessity of taking sides for or against Christ becomes still more inevitable where individuals and not classes are dealt with in the Gospels. There we find every man put to the test at his weakest point, and not a single jot of Christ's exclusive claim to supremacy is toned down or forgone, whoever the individual may be. Christ wants no disciple who has not counted the cost. Every one is tried exactly where, owing to his character, he is sure to feel Christ's service a hardship, exactly where sin is most attractive and conscience is most asleep. To the man who is adjourning the day of decision to a more convenient season, He says: 'Let the dead bury their dead, but come thou, follow me'; to the man who is covetous, and whose chief desire is set on riches: 'Sell all that thou hast, and come, follow me'; to the impure man: 'Whoso looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery already with her in his heart'; to the unforgiving: 'If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you'; to the proud and self-satisfied: 'Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven'; to the mass of commonplace folk belonging to all classes, who study first, and chiefly and always, their own interest and their own ease, but cloak their selfishness under the fashionable respectabilities of the day, He declares: 'Whosoever saveth his life—taketh the line of least resistance or any other form of self-indulgence or self-satisfaction—the same shall lose it.'

3. Is neutrality possible to-day? We all know that it is a matter of complete indifference to most of us whether certain laws of science are facts or not. Unless it is our specific duty to study these laws, we can adopt an attitude of absolute neutrality towards such conclusions of science as Einstein's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, or the theory of the Röntgen rays, and a hundred others, and be not one whit the better or one whit the worse by adopting such a neutral attitude.

But in regard to the claims of the moral and spiritual worlds, neutrality is impossible. And why? Just because these claims bear directly on and shape our conduct, whether we will or no, for good or evil. Hence, if they are true, they are of vital importance, and if we adopt a neutral attitude towards them, such neutrality amounts to a rejection of them; for we cannot stand still, morally or spiritually. If we are neutral, we are drifting, and drifting inevitably towards an attitude of indifference and spiritual death, or of active opposition. Professor James rightly maintains this very truth in his interesting work, *The Will to Believe*.

With the exception of a minority, that constitutionally are mentally or morally incapable or have made themselves such, all men are fitted to judge between the claims of right and wrong in some degree; and, when confronted with two alternative courses of conduct, to decide which is the higher and which the lower. But, not only are men fitted to decide for or against a certain line of action, they are bound by the essential nature of the spiritual and moral laws to come to a decision. For belief and doubt affect our conduct and affect it vitally, and herein enters the claim of Christ: 'He that is not with me is against me.' Hence if in such a case a man should say: I will adopt an attitude of neutrality, or I will come to a decision at a more convenient season, such a man by so doing has already decided against the moral or religious claim at issue.

James defines the religious man as one who believes 'in the existence of some kind of an unseen order in which the riddles of the natural order may be found explained.' He maintains

that the will to believe helps to create the facts, a result which is unattainable without such belief. Hence we should approach the claims of religion with the will to believe.

It is quite true, as we know from our everyday experience, that faith in a fact does help to create the fact. By trusting in another man's good faith, we may beget that very virtue in him. By owning that we are responsible beings and acting accordingly, we become more conscientious. Thus faith in a fact helps to create the fact, but—only so far as the fact is dependent on our own personal action. James, by omitting this limitation, seems in his essay to imply that our faith in the unseen world without us does in some way create this unseen world. But the will to believe cannot create that which was in existence before the act of belief, and is, and will be in existence after it, whether we will to believe or no.

And yet in respect of this spiritual world, the will to believe can render invaluable service. It cannot create that world, but it can create evidence attesting the reality of that world, and day by day can contribute fresh evidence. Faith in God finds its own verification through the influence it exerts on life and character.

The practical results of a belief provide evidence by which its truth or falsehood may be tested. By its fruits ye shall know of what character it is. Thus, though the will to believe cannot create truth that is independent of us, it can create evidence of truth that did not before exist. Hence St. Paul writes to his disciples, 'Ye are our epistles'—that is, epistles of the Lord—'known and read of all men.'

So we cannot halt between two opinions of vital importance. If the ever-accumulating evidence of Christian lives attests the reality of the spiritual world, then neutrality is impossible and wrong; for it amounts to a decision against the claims of Christ. There are thus no neutrals in this never-ending strife between Christ and the claims of the material life. Instinctively or deliberately, here, there, and everywhere, the consciences of men are enrolling themselves and cannot help enrolling themselves on this side or on that. It is the inevitable law of this struggle that not a single, solitary soul escapes this moral and spiritual conscription, and such is the greatness of this strife that the whole universe is divided into two camps—for Christ or against Him—and even the most distant stars fight, and must fight, in their courses against those that reject Him. 'He that is not with me is against me.'[1]

[1] R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 272.

God's Purpose as Revealed in Jesus Christ.

A PRELIMINARY QUESTION.

By the Reverend Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London.

The criticism of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* in Loisy's *The Gospel and the Church* has not only the immediate historical interest of presenting the contrast between Protestant Liberalism and Roman Catholic Modernism; it raises a more general and permanent issue: Is the distance, in time and space, with all the differences which this distance may involve, so great that Christ's mode of apprehending reality, intellectually, morally, and religiously cannot be ours, and must we acquiesce in an evolution which leaves little, if any, resemblance between His Christianity and ours? Would we not be at home at all in the presence of the historical Jesus? Would He Himself feel an exile among the best Christians of to-day? The dogmatic interpretation of the Scriptures erred in treating the Bible as a placeless and dateless communication of Divine truth; and we do not need to-day to be warned of, or guarded against, the errors and failures of that interpretation. Is not the danger of what claims to be the *historical* method that for it the temporal and local form hides a permanent and universal content which each age and each land can still apprehend? If we misrepresent Jesus in thinking Him as like ourselves, do we not also miss His meaning and

worth for us when we see only how unlike He is to ourselves? There is in some critical writings an *antiquarianism* that narrows the range of the thought and life of the past, and a *modernism* that mistakes some of the tendencies of to-day for the whole movement of the age. If Harnack erred in representing Jesus as a Liberal Protestant theologian of the nineteenth century, Loisy surely erred even more in thinking of Him only as a Jewish visionary and enthusiast. Granted that eschatologically Jesus did not think as the commentary of history on prophecy and apocalypse has taught us to think, did He think so differently from us ethically and theologically that we cannot find a common moral and religious standpoint from which we can understand His hope? I am confident that we can; and this essay is an attempt to understand what the mind of Jesus as regards future destiny can mean for us to-day.

I.

We must *first of all* recognize the fact that the Apostolic Church was dominated by the expectation of the speedy Advent of Christ in power and glory. Had there been nothing in the teaching of Jesus to awaken that hope, it would be difficult to find an explanation of that fact, as the Christian community would not be likely to accept the Jewish Apocalyptic literature, and make Christ Himself the centre of expectation, unless He had given some warrant for such an outlook. But granted the warrant, it is easy to understand how under the influence of that literature the hope would develop in detailed expectations, not found in the teaching of Jesus, and then without any dishonest intent would affect the transmission of that teaching. It is very probable that the Evangelists have given greater definiteness to the eschatology of Jesus than it originally possessed.

Secondly, we must recognize that much of the terminology was traditional, derived from the prophetic and apocalyptic writings; and Jesus used it, not with prosaic literalness, but as the prophets and apocalyptists had used it, as figurative and symbolical. Surely, with the parables before us, we cannot assume that Jesus meant that what He said should be taken *verbatim et literatim*. It is moral and spiritual reality He is presenting under cover of all this imagery.

Thirdly, as to the prophets of old, there were present to His mind the immediate and the ultimate future. He had the certain conviction that His rejection by the Jewish people meant, and could only mean, its doom. That He anticipated the destruction of Jerusalem as God's judgment is a conclusion which cannot be avoided. Surely His distress in death was partly at least due to this, that He knew that it involved such a disaster to the city, which He had striven to bring to penitence. It is to this He is surely referring when He limits the fulfilment of His predictions to this generation. As His rejection by the Jewish people involved this condemnation, the fulfilment of that judgment would be His vindication by God. Just as the prophets of old saw just behind the immediate future of God's judgment or deliverance the ultimate future of God's final fulfilment of His purpose, so would Jesus connect His manifestation in power and glory with that judgment on His foes. But He is not so confident of the second as of the first event in respect of time at least. It is surely to His Second Advent He is referring when He disclaims the knowledge He might have been expected to possess of that day and that hour. If the incarnation did involve a limitation of knowledge, if the consciousness of Jesus in regard to the future had the same characteristics as the consciousness of the prophets, it is in no way derogatory to His authority as moral and religious teacher to recognize that He set forth His hope of vindication and triumph in figurative, symbolic language, in poetry, and not prose, and that for Him as for the prophets of old, the action of God in human history was so certain and adequate that He did not realize the long and slow process in time between the immediate future which He so confidently dated, and the ultimate future of the time of which He so humbly confessed His ignorance.

Fourthly, there are parables of the Kingdom, *e.g.* the mustard-seed, the leaven, etc., which recognize the historical process, the activities of men which are involved in the fulfilment of the purpose of God. His teachings about God as Father, and man as child, of God's forgiveness and favour, and man's penitence and faith, of the better righteousness than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, of the greatest commandment of all, love shown in forgiving wrong, and ministering unto need even unto sacrifice, show that His outlook was wider than the eschatological school would have us believe. For it is not at all probable that the Christian Church, dominated as it was by the apocalyptic expectations,

added such religious and moral teaching. A moral and religious genius, to use the lowest term, is necessary to account for so harmonious a message; it cannot be explained by a composite authorship. This teaching is so congruous to the personality of Jesus as presented in the Gospels that thought and life confirm each other. Had the core of His message been a prediction which was not fulfilled, had that prediction not been quite a subordinate element, then undoubtedly He would have appeared as a visionary, and His authority in religion and morals would be by so much depreciated; but a sound literary and historical criticism does not justify such an assumption.

Fifthly, if this theological and ethical teaching is authentic, then the eschatological must be interpreted in the light of it. Even if He emphasized the activity of God in human history as we do not habitually, unless we have learned to think as He thought, He did not ignore that God's action is *conditioned*, limited, and delayed by man's. He summoned men to repentance and faith, and believed that God's grace was restrained by disobedience and unbelief. This consideration has force added to it, if we accept the theory, which I must regard as inadequate in view of all the data, that Jesus submitted to death in the hope that that death might accomplish what His life had failed to do, to bring about such a change in the attitude of men as would make the full coming of the Kingdom possible. He did not conceive of His second advent as merely a supernatural event brought about by the Divine omnipotence. For if, as we are entitled to assume, He believed that the Kingdom had come in promise and potency in Himself, and that the historical process by which it should fully come had already begun, He could not have thought of the consummation as in character incongruous with its commencement and its course. That Jesus thought of that consummation as God's act we cannot doubt; that He thought of it as an act unconditioned by man's actions we have no reason to believe; that His confidence in God's sufficiency on the one hand, and His inability on the other hand to realize how much man's sin and unbelief could hinder and delay God's action, led Him to anticipate a speedier consummation than the event has proved, is the best explanation we can offer of the, to our minds, seeming inconsistency of His faith in the present and His hope for the future of the one Kingdom.

II.

These considerations, which a study of the New Testament without the modernist assumptions justifies, lead us to a conclusion from which our further discussion may make a start.

Firstly, Jesus was not so apocalyptic, supernaturalist, catastrophic in His outlook as the modernists make Him out to be; He was not so remote from the way in which a modern man may think. He was more theological and ethical in His teaching than the modernists allow; and here the modern man may find himself on common ground. What is there in the brief summary of the teaching of Jesus which has been given in a preceding paragraph, that we cannot accept to-day with a clear reason and a clean conscience? If a difference remains, is it altogether to the advantage of the modern man, and the depreciation of the truth and wisdom of Jesus?

Secondly, there is a difference between the outlook of Jesus and the assumption of modernism; and I am confident that the Christian Church must choose between them; and if it is to live, grow, and endure, it must prefer the truth and wisdom of Christ to much of the thought of to-day. While in the controversy between Harnack and Loisy, I find myself in more general agreement with the former, yet Loisy does emphasize an element in the teaching of Christ which Harnack virtually ignores. The preceding discussion has been directed mainly against Loisy's exaggeration of this apocalyptic element; now we must seek to correct the error of Harnack's neglect of it.

Thirdly, the danger of the modern mind is to think that Evolution is a substitute for Creation, that God's activity must be limited by Nature as it is known to science, and that there can be no action of God in and through nature, which is not so explicable; that the human process in history is self-enclosed, and self-sufficient; and that God is only a spectator of and not an actor in the world drama. The crude conceptions of a supernaturalism which gloried in the shame of making faith appear as unreasonable as could be, *e.g.* that miracles are contrary to Nature, a violation of natural laws, that God intervenes in, and interferes with, the course of Nature, we must certainly abandon. Nature is not alien to God, so that He shows Himself God by suspending its operations, and disregarding its laws; this is a prejudiced belief, and not a

reasonable faith. For faith God is in all, and through all; in the physical forces there is a finite exercise of His infinite will; in the natural laws there is a finite expression of His infinite wisdom. The uniformity of nature is a token of the constancy of His purpose, and His fidelity to His promises. We should be plunged into mental confusion, and physical disaster, if God acted as capriciously in Nature as this supernaturalism represented Him as doing. But on the other hand to ignore God's activity, to limit God by Nature and man, to lay all the stress on the human process in history, to rely on man's resources and to neglect the resources in God which faith can reach, to summon men to work out their salvation without giving them the encouragement that it is God that worketh in them, is to challenge all religion as an illusion and a deception.

Fourthly, over against all such tendencies stands Jesus Christ, the author and finisher of faith, who proves all that faith can do in making God real, active, potent, dominant in the life of man. God was so real to Him that He always and everywhere found God; in Nature and History the Heavenly Father had worked hitherto, and He was working with and as God. God can direct the course of human history because He can influence the thoughts and lives of men; if there were only more faith in God, more confidence in His sufficiency, more submission to His authority, God could and would do greater things for men by men. The historical process, in which His purpose is being fulfilled, could be speeded beyond men's brightest hopes if faith were more confident and courageous. As Jesus did not find in Himself those hindrances of faith which so abound in other men, He expected great things from God as He attempted great things for God; and He expected men to share both His hopes and efforts.

Fifthly, the attention which is being now given to the teaching of Jesus regarding human duty is all to the good; but the promise this movement holds will be disappointed, if the fulfilment of human duty is regarded as itself sufficient, and the faith that relies on the resources of God is left out of account. There is no need to acquiesce, as many do, in the assumption that the process must be slow, since men move slowly in religion and morals. God can and will by His own Spirit speed the process, if only men are willing to suffer Him to be their sufficiency. It was not only that Christ had this confidence in what God could and would do; Paul, to whom to live was Christ, knew himself more than a conqueror, able to do all things through Him who strengthened Him. God's omnipotence will not, and in this moral and spiritual progress cannot override man's activities, since here men are and must be fellow-workers with God, and it is their development unto perfection which is the end. But the aspiration and the effort which are sustained by faith in God's will and power to fulfil His purpose in and with men will command more Divine resources, and cannot therefore measure the promise of the future by the possibilities of man alone. Two convictions the Christian mind to-day, if it is not to be misled by modernism, should learn from Christ. (i) There should be confidence in God's abounding resources, which man may claim according to the measure of his faith; and (ii) there should be confidence also that if only men can be brought to exercise faith, the fulfilment of God's purpose may be much speedier than now appears at all probable, and so the consummation, glorious and blessed, may lie, not in the dim and distant future, but nearer far than those dare to hope who reckon only with men, and leave out God. Faith can hasten, and unbelief can hinder the coming of the Kingdom, which, although in a human process, comes by the power of God's love, truth, and grace.

Contributions and Comments.

Christ's Resurrection as Evidence to Itself.

THE Resurrection of Jesus, as shown to us in the New Testament, whatever may be its ultimate purpose, is, in the first place, a resurrection to life upon this earth. As such it may be compared or contrasted with other returns, real or supposed, of dead men to the world; we need not now concern ourselves with 'the resurrection at the last day' or

any such future resurrection, and men's ideas of what it may be.

We have two kinds of return of the dead to the earth—resurrection, and the appearance of the spirit. Resurrection is a return to the normal conditions of earthly life: it is a return to health when the person has died of disease, as in the cases related both in the Old and New Testaments: in those in the Gospels there is in each case something told which emphasizes the return to normal conditions; the Lord commanded that something should be given to eat to the daughter of Jairus; the young man of Nain sat up and began to speak; Lazarus was to be loosed from his grave-clothes, and on a subsequent occasion sat at meat with others. When Herod supposed that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead, he thought of a normal life, whatever might be the difference between the former and the latter, and though he thought it accounted for the miracles.

The other form of return of the dead, the appearance of the spirit, is temporary, unsubstantial, and only seen by a few persons. Perhaps the best instance is the appearance of Samuel to the Witch of Endor and to Saul; the disciples at Jerusalem, when Jesus appeared to them, 'supposed that they beheld a spirit.' The spirit may be seen and heard; it bears a resemblance which can be recognized to the man in his past life.

But the Resurrection of Jesus is neither a return to the normal conditions of life, nor the appearance of a spirit, yet it has something of the nature of each. It is a new thing. He is the same Person after His Resurrection as before His Death; sooner or later He is always recognized; there are the marks of the nails and of the spear. Yet there is a difference: Mary Magdalene supposed Him to be the gardener (Jn 20^{11}); the two disciples going to Emmaus walk some distance with Him, talk with Him, and sit with Him before they know Him in the breaking of the bread (Lk 24^{13-35}); the Apostles took Him for a spirit (Lk 24^{37}); the seven disciples at the sea of Tiberias only know Him after the miracle of the draught of fishes (Jn 21^{1-14}); 'some doubted' when He met them in Galilee (Mt 28^{17}). There is a difference in His movements (if we may use the word): He appeared among the disciples when the doors were shut (Jn $20^{19.26}$); He vanished out of the sight of the disciples at Emmaus (Lk 24^{31}); 'He was parted from them [and was carried up into heaven]' (Lk 24^{51}); He 'was received up into heaven' ([Mk] 16^{18}). All these are plain statements. In addition, the other disciple who came with Peter to the sepulchre when he beheld the linen clothes 'saw and believed' (Jn 20^{8}); but this requires some explanatory theory. Here are a number of statements drawn from different Gospels, but all in keeping with one another, describing a kind of resurrection different from anything the writers had ever known before; a resurrection, not the appearance of a spirit (though for a moment mistaken for one), yet bearing some resemblance to such, lasting not for a few moments but for considerable periods, and repeated in various ways several times; He was not unsubstantial, but to be touched and eating with them. We are accustomed to use St. Paul's word and to describe our Lord's body after His Resurrection as a 'spiritual body,' because, while a body, it has some of the characteristics of a spirit. Could the disciples who record such a resurrection have either invented or imagined such a new thing? Invention and imagination alike have to draw on the known; they can combine different aspects of the known, but can scarcely create what is altogether unknown. A resurrection described by different minds with such consistency can only be founded on fact—the fact that it actually took place.

V. T. Kirby.

St. Peter's Vicarage, Thurgarton.

2 Timothy iv. 13 and the Question of St. Paul's Second Captivity.

The present trend of scholarship has for some time been against the whole traditional account of St. Paul's last days. No longer are we allowed to believe that he was released, that he made more journeys, revisiting his old friends in Ephesus, Philippi, and other places, and carrying the gospel message even to Spain. The second arrest and the imprisonment in some miserable Roman prison have been taken from us. And all this largely because the evidence for these things came from the Pastorals, and they were not written by St. Paul after all.

But two facts remain which seem to tell in favour of the old view in spite of the difficulties. There is the great weight of tradition, which should count for something, and there are certain passages in the Pastorals themselves. Whatever view may

be taken of those letters as they have come down to us, and of the date of the edition of them that we possess, surely no one can read them without seeing Paul's handwriting here and there all through. And of these authentic passages, 2 Ti 4^{13} is surely the least capable of having been invented. The overcoat, the MSS., the precious parchment rolls of Scriptures or of the Sayings and Doings of the Lord, left behind at Troas in the care of one Carpus: who would have thought of making that up? So that, if the critics are right about the imprisonment, these things must have been left behind at Troas that night when Eutychus fell asleep during the sermon with such alarming consequences, and Paul had to leave early next day. Then came the voyage to Jerusalem and the momentous events following the entry into the temple and two or three years' captivity at Cæsarea, and the long voyage that ended in shipwreck, and the winter at Malta, and the kindness of the Maltese in supplying the apostle and his friends with what they needed, to take the place of what had gone down with the ship. And then there were the two years in Rome, when Paul had frequent opportunities of seeing his friends, and people came to him from Ephesus and the Lycus valley and Macedonia, and took his letters and messages back with them. And after all this we are asked to believe that Paul suddenly remembered his overcoat and his books that he had left behind five or six years before!

But on the traditional theory, how it all fits in! He has gone on a journey, leaving some things he was not likely to want just then with a friend in Troas; and then he is suddenly arrested. In the chill of his Roman prison he begins to long for the overcoat he had left with Carpus a few weeks before, it may be, for winter is coming on, and he has had only too much experience of Roman winters, when he had felt the cold even in the comparative comfort of a hired room. And then there are his papers—letters written to him and copies of his replies, and he might need them for writing some last messages to his converts; but especially the parchments, with their words of consolation; no doubt he never travelled without some book or other of the Old Testament in his bag, but these particular rolls that he had not thought he should require on a missionary tour he finds he needs in a Roman prison when under sentence of death.

It is not good scholarship to build on a single text; but 2 Ti 4^{13}, if you look into it, is no bad foundation for the Second Imprisonment; it must be from Paul's hand, and so must a good deal more of that chapter, as is plain if it be read with any imagination at all. So there must have been a second captivity; but if so, may we not continue to believe that the Pastorals were written, at least in outline, by St. Paul himself?

J. Sinclair Stevenson.

Irish Mission,
Parantij, India.

1 Thessalonians i. 3.

'Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in (lit. *of*) our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father.'

So the A.V. This verse has been a stumbling-block, not to the translators, but to the interpreters. The difficulty lies in the string of genitives with the nouns on which they depend. Dean Alford says of the first pair, 'All sorts of strange meanings have been given to them.' The difficulty is to know whether the genitive in each case is one of origin ('work which faith brings forth'—Alford), or of possession, or of accompaniment. The R.V. follows the A.V. in simply translating the words as they stand. But what do the phrases 'work of faith,' 'labour of love,' and 'patience of hope' mean, and how does the final genitive connect on with the rest?

W. G. Rutherford (1908) renders: 'your acts of faith, your work of brotherly love, and your unwavering hope in our Lord.' Professor Moffatt has (1916) 'your active faith, and labour of love, and patient hope in our Lord.'

Is not the simplest explanation that the genitives are adjectival genitives, so common in Hebrew and also in the N.T.? In that case the English would be 'your faithful (*or* loyal) work, your loving labour, and your hopeful patience.' The dependence of the last genitive, 'of our Lord,' is not so straightforward. It really does not depend upon 'hope' but upon 'patience,' and 'patience' really means 'waiting,' from the Hebrew *qavah*. The last words would therefore be 'the waiting of the hope of the Lord,' which is the Hebrew way of saying 'the hopeful waiting for the Lord.'

T. H. Weir.

Glasgow College.

2 Kings iv. 26.

A SIDE-LIGHT FROM EAST AFRICA.

Some readers have probably felt surprise in reading this verse. Although the Shunammite woman has lost her son by death, when Elisha asks her if it is well with her husband and child, she replies, 'Well.' It seems to our Western minds not quite true. The woman goes on afterwards to tell Elisha her trouble without any sort of explanation of her previous apparently contrary statement. The explanation is that she was simply following Eastern custom, and in East Africa to-day we can find almost exact parallels. A Swahili-speaking African even now greets another by saying *Jambo*, which, amongst other things, means 'trouble,' and the greeting is a contraction for 'Have you any trouble?' The answer to the greeting is *Sijambo*, which means 'no trouble.' This answer is invariably given as a matter of course and is not intended as a statement of fact, but only as a greeting. After the greeting the person concerned may get to business and tell any amount of troubles. Another question of like nature often asked on meeting a person is *Habari zako?* which means literally 'thy news,' but practically 'What is your news?' Again the answer, whatever the news may be, is an invariable one, namely, *njema*, which means 'good.' This, like the above, is not meant literally, but merely as a greeting, after which the real news may be told. It will be evident how closely this resembles the case of the Shunammite woman. Her first reply (*shalom*) was merely a matter of customary courtesy, and was not intended as a statement of fact.

Henry Holloway.

S. Magnus, Lerwick.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

What it is that saves.

'Forthwith, I doubt not, there arises this question in your minds: What place, then, in particular, has the death of Jesus in this whole soul of Him that saves, this whole career of His that restores us to God? It has the central place. It does not stand alone, but it has the central place. All else in His saving life, His saving resurrection, His saving presence with us here to-night, is congregated about His death. It is Jesus Himself who saves, all that He was, and became, and is; but this Jesus that saves comes from the Cross to do it. *It is Jesus that died who saves.* This may seem to contradict what I said a little ago; but it is not so. It was not the death of Jesus that saved Peter; but it was the Jesus, that all the time, even in Galilee, was what His death completed and sealed, who saved Peter. It was not the death of Jesus that saved Stephen; but it was the Jesus that died and still bore the signs of His martyrdom in the invisible realm, who saved Stephen. It is not the death of Jesus, an isolated event in the career of Jesus, that saves you and me. It is the Jesus that died, who saves us.'[1]

[1] A. Boyd Scott, *Nevertheless we Believe*, 63.

Spiritualism.

'There are people about us, who, if we may trust their assertions, should be able to help us. They are the people called Spiritualists. They certainly declare to us that they can and do communicate with those who live beyond the veil. Surely this is hopeful! In reality it proves hopeless. So far as we can hear, no priest or prophet among them all has got into touch with the living Christ. They share our disappointment. They try to explain the silence. They affirm that the more developed and purified a spirit is, the farther removed it is from this earthly life and intercourse with this material world. Jesus Christ is too exalted to communicate. Other spirits, in their communications, do sometimes give us news of Him. But, according to these, Christ is removed and remote, as I have described, while others among the spirits declare that they are no nearer Him there than they were on earth. This is, to say the least of it, very disconcerting and disappointing. It is so disconcerting that, even on this point apart from others, I grow more than sceptical of the whole cult of Spiritualism. As a believer in the living Christ, I have a right to demand that they shall put me into communication with Him. For, do

they not tell me that, in the unseen while the lower spirits cannot ascend at will, the higher spirits can descend as they choose? But if that be so, must not even the exalted Christ descend to my longing? In a séance, as my Spiritualist friends assure me, I open a door into the very realm of the blessed departed. If it be so, how dare Christ refuse to descend and reveal Himself to me? If He refuse, as He does, then He is no more the lover of weak and aspiring souls He was in the days of His flesh: can I think this possible? That is the one alternative. The only other alternative is this, that the living Christ in the unseen simply repels and declines the practices of these necromancers. For myself I feel shut up to accept this second alternative. I am impressed with the fact that Christ, who in Galilee dealt gently with superstition, and even responded to the magically minded, who this very night in remote Italian villages responds to the superstitious, will make no response whatever to the people called Spiritualists.' [1]

'Be a Steamer.'

Twenty-four talks to Boy Scouts by Headmasters and men who thoroughly understand boys have been published with the title *How to Make the Most of Life* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net).

One of the talks is by the Rev. E. W. Shepheard-Walwyn. It is on 'The Three Boats.' 'Don't be a barge,' he says to the Scouts, 'for it is quite the flattest kind of thing to be—just to let yourself be pulled any way any thing likes to pull you, and to have no power inside that keeps you going in one fixed direction.'

'And don't be a sailing vessel, though it is better than a barge, as it can get along without being towed. But it depends upon the wind and currents being favourable.'

What is the Boy Scout to be, then? 'Be a steamer,' says Mr. Shepheard-Walwyn. 'That's the thing! I expect you have been in one, and have seen how the bow slaps the waves on their wet faces, and how the vessel forges along in the teeth of opposing winds and currents. The steamer has a power within.

'God can give something to you which will turn you into a steamer, so that you will be able to go along straight on the right way, and not care a little bit what the others do or say to you.'

[1] A. Boyd Scott, *Nevertheless we Believe*, 80.

The Letters of St. Paul.

'Thus these glowing Epistles become a fitting climax to what has preceded them. As it was the purpose of Paul's earlier letters to liberalize the Christian faith, and of the second group to spiritualize it, and of the more formal Epistle to the Romans to systematize it, so in the meditations and revelations of Paul's last phase he is absorbed in the idealizing of history, the lifting of its prose into poetry, the setting of its facts within a cosmic plan. The first intention of Paul was to rescue the new faith from Palestinian asphyxiation and to give it a chance to breathe in the free air of a Greek world; his second aim was the emancipation of that faith from ceremonial and ritual and to secure for it the authority of the spirit; his third desire was to justify that faith by logical reasoning and to rationalize the convictions which he has attained. Finally, he ascends from these plains of debate and demonstration into the serener air of contemplation and vision, as the first disciples went up with their Master on the Mount of Transfiguration, and saw there a glory which was invisible below.' [2]

St. Paul in Art.

'It is suggestive to recall the fact that in the comprehensive Calendar of Saints approved by ecclesiastical authorities, from St. Joseph the father of Jesus, to the last subject of canonization, the Apostle Paul has held a very minor place. The most conspicuous convert to the new faith, its hero, preacher and martyr, beyond all comparison the most effective agent in its propagation, Paul is rarely one of the figures which Christian art has loved to commemorate, or before whose shrine the faithful have loved to bend. He is seldom portrayed except as the companion of Peter, and while the chief apostle holds the keys, Paul is to be recognized by the less sacred symbol of the sword. "Is there," asks Mrs. Jameson, "among the thousand representations of the Apostle Paul, *one* on which the imagination can rest completely satisfied? I know not one."' [3]

NEW POETRY.

N. Marshall Ford.

The Bridge of Flowers, by Mr. N. Marshall Ford (Erskine Macdonald), is a rather irritating book.

[2] F. G. Peabody, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*, 119.

[3] *Ibid.* 7.

Many of the poems show very good work, but many are marred—one might almost say ruined—by too great straining of images and of language. We do not refer to the occasional liberties the author takes with English grammar, as in:

He, as of old, still offereth might,
Mountains to move to they who trust,

but to such verses as that which opens the volume:

Earth fell from far,
A bud of sombre flame.
A wandering star
From nests of stars she came.
Shook the great trees
By Life's far river fed;
Their mystic fruits
And gulfs were peopled.

We do not say that this verse is meaningless, but we *do* say that it is needlessly obscure, and a succession of such verses becomes tedious. Fortunately not all the poems lie open to this objection, and we quote the two verses of

THE MASTER.

Deep in His eyes
Lay knowledge of the earth and skies
Master of all the mysteries
Of seed and bloom,
Of sun and tide,
Of beauty, wide as earth is wide.
He veiled—to teach us sacrifice.

Who fathoms evil? Who can say
That Nature loves to rend and slay.
Fights she the forces day by day
Which ambush
This dim way of ours?
Sees she, when serpents crouch in flowers
Lion and lamb together play.

Bessie W. Rumsby.

Though there are here and there hints of drab city streets with their hustle and noisy traffic in the little collection of poems by Bessie W. Rumsby, *In the Street* (Edgar & Skinner; 1s. 6d. net), much more in evidence are the fragrant scent of gardens and of country lanes and meadows, the glint of daffodils on mossy banks, and the perfume of violets and of wallflower.

Mrs. Rumsby is the wife of the Rev. F. W. Rumsby, Minister of Kent Street Baptist Church, Portsea, Portsmouth, who in a foreword explains that the poems are reprinted from their Church Magazine and other periodicals in response to urgent requests from all quarters to do so.

'HE GIVETH UNTO HIS BELOVED IN THEIR SLEEP.'
—Ps. cxxvii. 2 (R.V.).

I dreamed of roses all the night,
Then waking, faced the toilsome day—
But oh, the perfume of my dream
Trailed with me all along the way!

E'en so He gives us in our sleep
Not only rest, but visions bright;
And wond'rous melodies He weaves
Amid the silences of night!

And best of all He takes us back
To childhood's haunts, and lets us stray
Thro' early Beulah-lands, and view
The Heaven that is not far away!

The doubter looks again to God—
The wavering readjustment find;
Because in dreams we live again
The child-white days we left behind!

These 'treasures of the darkness' span
The present with its want and fear,
And hold us to our earliest faith,
That God, and Heaven, are always near!

Hope Fairfax Taylor.

Hope Fairfax Taylor is the author of *Songs for Disciples* (Blackwell; 2s. net). The poems, which are not all religious (as the title might suggest), are simple lyrical pieces for the main part. At times the verse becomes rather prosy—witness the following passage taken almost at random from 'Our Village':

Is it only a vision the poet
Never may live to see
Fulfilled? A dream in the heart of God
Unwrought in reality?

We quote one of a series of three sonnets, 'In Memory E. F. T.', entitled

NEW FOUND.

Beloved, when thou wentest first, alone,
Whither I might not follow as I knew,
Over the high pass, where the stars are few
And stones are many and the road unknown,
I could not pray—thou seemed'st no more mine own
But God's. I could not sing—no sweet accord
In answer sang, no more might share the stored
Delight of life—thou hadst my thoughts outgrown.
But now I commune with thee in the courts
Of song and silence 'neath the open sky;
We meet in happier mansions and my thoughts
Wing with thine own and purer heights descry;
My narrow prayer unfolds to greet the Sun,
I see the splendour of the Three in One.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The supreme mind in history is the mind of Jesus. Confucius, the Buddha, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Paul, Augustine, Shakespeare—these are all great minds, minds which in profound and subtle ways have influenced innumerable other minds; but the mind which has already exercised, and—we as Christians believe—is destined still to exercise, an influence alike incomparable and incalculable is the mind of Jesus. He cleaves history in two—the time before and the time after He appeared. Every time we write B.C. or A.D. we are paying an unconscious tribute to His supreme and universal significance.

Wherein lies the supremacy of Jesus? It lies, in part, in a certain all-pervasive yet indefinable originality. Originality is as difficult to define as inspiration, but its presence is as easy to detect, or at any rate to feel. Jesus spoke with an authority which went home to the hearts of His hearers as the words of the average scribe never did or could. The common people felt it instinctively and instantly, and that was one of the reasons why they heard Him gladly. Here was One who brushed past all sophistries and erudite irrelevancies, and went straight to the central heart of the moral world. Wherein did His originality lie?

It was partly an originality of utterance. His way of speech was as unique as were the actual things He said. 'Never man spake like this man.' That was the testimony of those who heard Him, and it was perhaps as much a testimony to His style as to the quality of His thoughts. Quite reverently we may say of Jesus that the style was the Man. Among all the criteria that have been used for detecting His genuine words, this might be applied as successfully as any.

Take such a word as this, 'No man can serve two masters.' What a penetrating criticism of life! and how completely and finally it disposes of all our specious attempts at compromise! But could the thing itself be better said? It is one of those words which no one who heard could ever forget—by it the principle of compromise in the moral life is shattered for ever. Or take the words, 'All live unto him' (*i.e.* God). Or 'Love your enemies.' Our familiarity with these and similar words blinds us to their amazing trenchancy. And the speech of Jesus abounds in such criticisms, commands, and statements of principle, expressed in pithy, terse, epigrammatic, and ever-memorable ways, yet in ways which no reverent soul would describe as brilliant. There is no straining after effect, no tantalizing scintillation, no wearisomely sparkling antitheses. It is the grave simplicity of a marvellously clear, profound, and original mind.

The originality of Jesus lies also partly in the

insight and range of His thought. To appreciate this to the full, we have to see His thought against the background of the thought of His contemporaries: the contrast enables us to feel how daring, how fresh, how original He was, and how much His mind rose above those other minds to which, in the Providence of God, He may have owed not a little. Dr. WALKER, in his *The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age* (reviewed in 'Literature'), elaborates this contrast on the basis of a thorough and systematic study, and so contributes to our appreciation of the originality of Jesus.

With regard to His insight, contrast, for example, His conception of the Sabbath with that of His contemporaries. The philanthropic idea of the Sabbath, as Dr. WALKER reminds us, had gone into the background, and its observance had become just a love-token given to God—'an act done just because it met what they believed was His will, which on other grounds they knew to be just and generous.' 'In ordinary human relationship love-tokens have often nothing to justify them save that they *are* love-tokens—they are understood and appreciated as such: in terms of common usefulness they cannot always be evaluated, or perhaps even justified.' So the Sabbath was kept chiefly in this spirit and for this end. It was far otherwise with Jesus. 'He was, from the point of view of Jewish ortho-*praxy*, most startlingly original: to His mind there was no love-token to God enshrined in ceremonial exactitude in keeping Sabbath, which could take precedence of what was contained in the faithful continuance of the ministry of helpfulness to people in need throughout this most sacred day of the week.'

With regard to the range of His thought, we are reminded that the best Judaism of His day failed to be, in the finest sense, 'kind toward the unthankful and evil' or mean. Mercy and love are qualities the range of whose obligation was immensely extended by Jesus. He definitely removes all class or racial limitation from the familiar term 'neighbour.' And Dr. WALKER quotes with approval the striking and profoundly important admission of Dr. I. Abrahams, that 'we do not find in the Rabbinic literature a parallel to the striking paradox, *Love your enemies*.' Such a statement from such a quarter is enough to put Jesus in a place all by Himself. His originality is beyond challenge.

But after all, His originality is not so much a thing to be detected and expressed in detail; rather is it a quality inherent in His entire personality. It is not so much that what He said and what He did was original, but that *He* was original, in all the range and compass of His being. When He says, 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; *even as I have loved you*, that ye also love one another,' we are face to face with His sublime originality in its most complete and personal expression. There was nothing entirely new in the command to love one another; the freshness of the commandment lies in the addition, 'as I have loved you.' The precept is enforced by His own transcendent example. Or, as Dr. WALKER puts it, 'He commended a love which no limitation, or misunderstanding, or shortcoming, or treachery could stifle—a missionary love bent ever in evoking love from others: their mutual love must be according to the standard which He has set.' Never was there love or originality like this.

In his Croall lecture (reviewed in 'Literature') Dr. KAY offers a very sympathetic sketch of Islam, which has to be taken the more seriously as it rests upon a knowledge of modern Moslem life as well as of its ancient literary documents. 'As British citizens, we are linked with seventy million Moslems in the fellowship of our commonwealth of nations; and their spiritual ideals would act as a wholesome tonic to our own.' What are those ideals? They are, among other things, Prayer, Almsgiving, and Fasting.

The hard-working man will pause for three

minutes to pray, as he is digging a drain on the hillside. Benevolence to men and kindness to animals are characteristic of the Moslem. The love of inordinate wealth has never been his failing: 'Moslem millionaires are almost unknown to history.' The Bolshevist call to destroy the capitalist will have little power over Moslem hearts, and 'God-fearing men everywhere may rejoice that Islam offers so strong a bulwark against general anarchy.'

More particularly has Professor KAY been impressed by Moslem sobriety. 'Any stranger who has tried to observe the hunger-stricken Ramazan, will never accuse Islam of pandering to the appetites of sense. The will-power of the Moslem was so developed in his contest with the pangs of hunger that his wholesome triumph over wine became an assured success,' so much so that the society of total abstainers founded by the Prophet is numbered by scores of millions and has lasted over a thousand years. 'By appealing in the name of Allah,' he adds, 'to the voluntary choice of his adherents, Mohammed succeeded where many zealous agencies have failed.' Is there a hint here which temperance reformers might adopt in the prosecution of the No Licence Campaign?

One other point of interest in Islam is the intellectual activity which accompanied it for centuries. 'Aristotle was better known in Islam than in Christendom.' True, there has been a long period of stagnation and sterility, but there are signs that this may pass, and that high hopes of good may be justifiably cherished from the fresh activity of the Moslem intellect.

The Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Professor George MILLIGAN, D.D., D.C.L., has published the address which he delivered to the Assembly this year, under the title, *The Church and the New Testament* (Blackwood; 6d. net). One advantage of appointing an eminent scholar to such an office is that, like the President of the British Association, he has the opportunity of reviewing the present position of the science of which he is an expert teacher. The address which lies before us is an admirable proof of the wisdom of such an appointment, for Dr. MILLIGAN does here what was very much needed. He gives in popular language a statement both of the results of New Testament scholarship and of the principles that guide the scholar in his inquiries.

Dr. MILLIGAN starts by referring to two important facts. One is the real desire among educated Church members for knowledge about the origin and authority of New Testament writings. The other is the perplexity and apprehension which exist in connexion with the results of inquiry. These facts make it an urgent matter for the Church to share with her people the best knowledge she can reach on the primary documents of her faith.

The Moderator begins his exposition by dwelling on the fact that there was a Church before there was a New Testament. Christianity was not at first a book religion, and its writings were not the cause but the product of Christian faith. The power of this Church lay precisely in a personal witness to the power of a great truth. That is to say, in New Testament times there was no New Testament.

Of course this could not continue. The need of instruction, the claims of heretical opinions, the dubiety about crucial questions, all created a demand for authoritative written documents. And such were provided in plenty, perhaps too great plenty. First there were letters. Naturally so. A letter is the most direct form of writing and it was the obvious way of answering questions when these arose. But the Gospels were not long in following. There are strong reasons for believing that the first three Gospels were all in existence before A.D. 70.

In some admirable pages Dr. MILLIGAN describes the growth of the New Testament Canon. First

the process of ratification given to certain books by the spiritual life of the Church, and of elimination of others by the same standard. Then the second period when the exact limits to be set to the Canon were discussed and settled. The Epistle to the Hebrews was regarded doubtfully because of its uncertain authorship, and the Apocalypse owing to the strange character of its teaching. The fact, however, of most importance to be remembered is that the decision on all such matters was given not by any council or external authority, but by the general consciousness of the whole Church.

Dr. MILLIGAN then goes on to deal with two questions on which the ordinary reader desires assurance. The first is this: What security have we that we possess our New Testament in its original form? That is a question of textual criticism and is answered by a brief account of the way in which scholarship has arrived at its conclusions. The second question is more important: What confidence can we place in the trustworthiness of our New Testament writings as historical documents?

As to this the Professor's judgment is quite reassuring. He points out that all along the line the movement of criticism is at present backwards to tradition. Nine Epistles are now 'generally accepted' as Pauline. The sources of the Synoptic Gospels put the Evangelists 'practically into the position of eye-witnesses.' 'In particular, the old charges of idealised fiction or dogmatic bias, at one time so freely brought against them, are no longer worthy of serious attention.'

As regards 'the only strictly historical book in the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, we may take it as now fully established that it was the work of the third Evangelist, St. Luke.' In writing it he made use of earlier documents, one, perhaps written in Aramaic, containing materials dealing with the first thirty years of the Church's history; another, a travel-diary, on which he depended for his account of Paul's journeys. The date of Acts is quite probably as early as A.D. 64.

Dr. MILLIGAN concludes with an earnest appeal to the clergy to exercise a teaching ministry with regard to this whole matter, and quotes Canon Streeter's striking words: 'The danger to-day is, not that the clergyman, in trying to solve difficulties, shall only suggest them, but that, by studiously avoiding them, he shall suggest that no solution exists.'

In the *Hibbert Journal* for July there is a fascinating article by Professor LUTOSLAWSKI of the Polish University at Wilno on 'The Conversion of a Psychologist.' It is a striking piece of autobiography, rivalling in its dramatic character St. Paul's account of his conversion. Religious conversions, the writer says, differ from other conversions in being more thorough, involving a greater change in the whole personality. But this very thoroughness makes them more difficult to investigate, because the convert becomes so much of an apostle that he ceases to take an interest in the scientific value of his own experience.

To get a reliable judgment on any conversion two conditions must be fulfilled. It must be lasting, for one thing. It must endure for a long time. And, secondly, the convert must retain his scientific curiosity during all this time, his interest in objective truth. Apostles are rarely scholars, and almost never scientific investigators. If a scientifically trained scholar should undergo a religious conversion, become an apostle of his particular creed, and remain, through all the long time needed for a thorough testing of his conversion, also a scholar, an investigator, and a scientific teacher, then we have the requisite conditions for a sound judgment on his experience.

Professor LUTOSLAWSKI claims the fulfilment of these conditions in his own case. It is twenty-two years since his conversion took place, and during all that time he has remained a student and teacher of philosophy. A detailed account of his work is given in support of this claim. And then follows

the narrative of his religious experience. He was born in the Roman Catholic Church, but threw off his allegiance at the age of eighteen.

He passed to complete scepticism in an extraordinary fashion. A girl whom he loved was going to marry an atheist. This outrage he resolved, if possible, to prevent. He prayed to Christ to intervene, and this was to be the test of the reality of the Saviour's existence. He challenged Christ to save the girl from the impending marriage. The marriage took place, and young Lutoslawski renounced all religious belief.

Then began a weary pilgrimage towards the light. The first step was the discovery of his own personality and its significance, and that meant a belief in freedom and immortality. But there was no atom of Christian belief in this discovery. Then came the reading of certain religious biographies which are mentioned. And on the back of this arrived the entirely unexpected revelation, which must be given in his own words.

'Early in the morning I went to a steam-bath in which I remained for an hour, talking merrily with some students on philosophical and political subjects. When I left the bath, suddenly the analogy between a clean body and a clean soul took hold of my thoughts, and without any conceivable reason, without reflection, almost automatically, I entered a small Franciscan convent, where I knew a monk, a veteran of 1863. . . . I found him in the church, and asked him to hear my confession. I kneeled down, scarcely aware of what I was doing. I began a general confession of my life, and concluded with the avowal that I had no faith in Creation, the Divinity of Christ, eternal damnation, and the power of the Church to remit sins.'

The priest urged him to receive communion. He refused at first, having no faith. On being pressed, however, he yielded, 'and in the very moment when I accepted from the hands of the priest the consecrated host, suddenly came the change which transformed my life.' It was not an intellectual adhesion to faith. 'My chief impression was the awe of a wonder, the clear consciousness of a mysterious powerful Presence.' The first intellectual conclusion of this experience was that, if he wished to repeat it, he had to depend on the Church and become a member of that Church again.

The sequel was a long succession of experiments in order to ascertain whether he could really become a member of the Church. He practised daily communion and mental prayer. The latter habit became the stay of his soul until he lived more by it than by the rites of the Church. He analyses at length the results of his mystical experience, and declares that the moral and spiritual power then received has lasted and increased during these twenty-two years. The general discussion of conversion with which the essay closes is intensely interesting and enlightening, and the whole story, so vivid and so penetrating, is a substantial Christian apologetic.

No living scholar has a better right than Sir George Adam Smith to tell us how the Old Testament should be taught. For many years from the Professor's chair, and for many years in pulpits, he has been teaching and preaching it with a power, skill, and eloquence which have carried his fame across the world. He has, as he reminds us, had forty-five years' experience of the influence of modern criticism upon his own faith. So it is with peculiar interest and hope that we approach his lecture on *The Teaching of the Old Testament in Schools* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6d. net), which was delivered to the Conference of University Tutors and Schoolmasters at Cambridge in January of this year.

He introduces the discussion with the modesty of a man who recognizes that even in a subject on which he is an expert, certain aspects of it may be more familiar than certain others. He is address-

ing schoolmasters on the Teaching of the Old Testament, and he begins by reminding himself that 'to schoolboys I have never taught it at all.' And towards the close it is delightful to hear him admit that he does not know 'with what period it is best to start the teaching of the history to younger pupils'—whether with the Patriarchal period or the Mosaic, or the Conquest of Canaan or the beginning of the Monarchy; nor does he profess to know where the story of Creation should come in. These are indeed provokingly difficult questions, and perhaps only very experienced teachers of boys could solve them, if indeed they can ever be finally solved at all.

Principal Smith has been assured from many quarters, he tells us, that of late years the influence of the Old Testament has waned. We hope not. Dr. Smith's own magnificent expository work on the prophets has surely established, definitely and unchallengeably, that the Old Testament—not in spite of, but precisely because of, criticism—is not only preachable, but amazingly modern. And this is one of the many points that he makes, that 'the effect of the critical movement as a whole has been not destructive but constructive and illuminating.'

The principles on which the teacher must proceed are (i) the frank recognition that 'the Old Testament contains the record of a Divine Revelation, but exhibits that Revelation as proceeding, as do all the works of God, by gradual development; and (ii) that the teacher has the duty of using the liberty which Christ has proclaimed and exemplified.'

The true understanding of the first principle obliges the teacher to recognize the strength and, just as frankly, the weakness of the Old Testament. There are in it beggarly elements: the more honestly he recognizes their presence, the more surely must he also recognize the presence within them and the action upon them of the Divine Spirit, which was potent to transform them so wonderfully, and to effect so unique a Revelation. Again in adopting the second principle, that of liberty, the teacher is but following in the footsteps of Christ, who 'was the greatest and most drastic critic of the Old Testament,' as is evident, among other things, from His attitude to the old laws of retaliation and divorce.

A very interesting point, to which we referred last month, Principal Smith incidentally touches upon—the place of the prophet and the priest in religion. Are these two dominant figures antagonistic or complementary? In one passage he describes the Prophets as 'great souls struggling towards a purer faith through debates with God and themselves, and *conflicts with priestly and legal tradition*.' But it would not be fair to infer from this that he regards prophecy as a complete exhibition of the mind of God. For elsewhere he reminds us that here 'as in all other ages and nations, controversy between opposite opinions has been a means of reaching the truth'; and still more explicitly, that the differences or contradictions between, *e.g.*, Jeremiah and Deuteronomy with regard to the Law, the Temple, and the Divine origin of sacrifices, 'are only proofs that among the methods of Divine Revelation under the Old Covenant, in addition to the vision and inspiration which came by direct action of God's Spirit on the spirits of men, there were those other processes by which the truth has been sifted and beaten out in all ages, namely, by debate and controversy between equally earnest minds and schools of thought, *with neither of which lay the whole truth*.'

Every teacher, Principal Smith insists, must take as the basis of his work the Authorized Version, wonderful alike for the music of its style, for its wisdom, and for its uplifting and inspiring power upon human life. The Revised Version, while on the whole clearer, has 'missed a great opportunity' in not adding, *e.g.*, such marks of quotation as would serve to indicate the emergence of new speakers or a reference to older sayings or popular proverbs. The Revisers' failure to indicate the metrical form in which much, if not most, of prophecy was written,

is touched with a gentle hand. It was not 'their blame that they were not so in advance of their time.' This defect has now been remedied by several German and English translations, some of which are specially mentioned by name.

Not the least interesting part of the lecture is that in which Dr. Smith discusses the difficulties of metrical translations, especially of those which attempt to reproduce the original in modern forms of speech. With some of these latter he is manifestly not well pleased. Some of their phrases sound, as he amusingly puts it, as if they 'had come round the corner—instead of from Heaven.' But he pays a hearty tribute to these versions for their praiseworthy and often successful endeavour to bring out 'the lilt and the charm of the Hebrew verse.' We look forward with special interest to Principal Smith's own forthcoming book on Jeremiah, which will doubtless exhibit very adequately the poetic as well as the prophetic quality of that great prophet.

He maintains that the pupil should be made early acquainted with the configuration of the land, and made to feel that much that meets us in history is explained by geography. But, whatever part of the history should be dealt with first, 'Psalms and Proverbs, at least in selections, could be taken, I suppose, anywhere or rather everywhere. But I know that I would like to reserve for the higher classes the whole period of the Prophets, with its ethics and politics, its spiritual agonies,' and its growing apprehension of the mind of God.

The lecture closes with three illuminating observations: (i) that it is the fashion of the Old Testament, as of the Ancient East, to which the idea of evolution was unfamiliar, to express a long historical development or spiritual process as happening at once. Deuteronomy, *e.g.*, which criticism has shown to be the fruit of centuries, is represented as the utterance of Moses in one day. (ii) Truth comes through controversy and the clash of opinion, and neither of two opposing types possesses a monopoly of it. (iii) The 'rage of the righteous,' illustrated by Jeremiah, is explained partly by a passionate desire for justice and the vindication of the moral order, but still more perhaps by the absence of faith in the life to come. From this latter, especially, we learn 'the difference Christ has made.'

Jeremiah and Jesus—in Comparison and Contrast.

By the Reverend H. A. Williamson, B.D., Lochee, Dundee.

Jeremiah is attracting considerable attention at the present time, partly because he is the most self-revealing of all the prophets, and partly because of his anticipations of Christianity. He has gone far in preparing the way of freeing religion from the bonds of nationalism. While he does not altogether discard the old form of nationalism, he has really advanced beyond it, and places religion on an individualistic basis. Jeremiah's work therefore represents a new step in the evolution of Israel's faith. The aim of the prophet is one of emancipation from out-worn forms. He reaches forward to a new idealism, in which the human spirit is free to get direct into the presence of God. He is an intuitionalist, who dispenses with any intermediary ritual. The radical nature of such teaching is evident. Every priestly office is rendered unnecessary; and the most cherished traditions of Israel become of no value to one who has now the 'inward' law. Torah and Temple, which were the most distinctive features of the national life, are shorn of their worth.

We need not wonder that the prophet suffered for these advanced views, or that the priests of the temple hated him for his 'nihilism.' Apart from their own material interests, they looked at his teaching as subversive of their peculiar greatness. The very institutions which Jeremiah

attacked were in their eyes the symbol of an unbreakable bond with Yahweh. The posthumous honour which the Jews paid Jeremiah shows that succeeding ages did not grasp the actual trend of his prophecies. When we reach the time of Jesus, we notice that the Law and the Temple were still clung to with fanatical intensity. Our Lord had to meet practically the same opposing forces as Jeremiah. Jesus was brought to trial because He was thought to be destroying the nation and its sacred institutions. The rulers saw clearly that, if His teachings were accepted, the end of Jewry had come. Caiaphas makes no secret of it at all, but boldly announces that Christ must die to preserve the nation. The High Priest feared the intervention of the Romans chiefly on political grounds. Nevertheless, the Sadducæan party were well aware how the teachings of Jesus undermined their authority. It is noteworthy that the proto-martyr of the church was stoned to death because he had been heard saying, 'Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.' By the timely intervention of friendly magistrates Jeremiah was saved from a similar fate at the hands of the angry priests. His temple-discourse (ch. 7) issued in his trial (ch. 26), and he escaped only because of the more tolerant outlook of the laity.

In the Gospel narratives it is stated that Jesus was vaguely associated with Jeremiah in the mind of the people. This, however, is simply the result of the powerful impression created by the preaching of Jesus. To get a standard of comparison, they had to rank this new personality with the greatest men of their history. Yet the points of resemblance are not merely superficial. Jeremiah is a forerunner of Jesus; and Jesus had to do his work of reform over again. Both had to utter plain warnings against any external conception of religion. Both had to condemn superstitious reverence for the Mosaic Code and Temple ritual. Both had to bring back to its true place the moral and spiritual requirements of worship. This is true also of other reformers; but the parallelism between Jeremiah and our Lord is very close. In the cleansing of the Temple, Jesus borrows the actual expression of the prophet. The money-changers have made His Father's House a den of thieves (cf. Jer 7^{11}). Moreover, the mind of Christ was dwelling much on Jeremiah's oracles as His death was drawing near. There is reason to think that the covenant-idea of the Last Supper is based on Jer 31^{31-34}. The cup is described as 'my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many' (Mk 14^{24}). In 1 Co 11^{25} Paul refers to it in unmistakable terms, 'This cup is the *new* covenant in my blood.' The Saviour thus linked up His work with Jeremiah's prediction, which has been called the high-water mark of O.T. prophecy. This illustrates clearly how near Jeremiah came to the spirit of Jesus. The points of contrast will be considered later on. It will be useful to study, in the first place, some of the resemblances.

I.

Jeremiah is a forerunner of Christ in his criticism of the Torah, and the popular opinions that had gathered round it. The ordinary Jewish mind conceived of the law as absolute and imperishable. Was it not of Divine origin? Did it not contain the immutable decrees of Yahweh? It was, therefore, a bold step of the prophet to come forward and declare that the Divine law had become an obstacle to vital religion, and was soon to be supplanted by another. This was contrary to all that the nation had been taught to believe. The people could not simply understand the mentality of the prophet. In his eyes the Torah of Sinai was conditioned by obedience; and all its terms had been shamelessly violated. The 'pact' between Yahweh and His people had been broken. Thus there is no condemnation of the actual law by Jeremiah, except that he recognizes its practical failure. It passes away, because Israel has persisted in rejecting its moral demands. It has remained a merely external ordinance. This has resulted in a fatal obduracy of heart (שְׁרִירוּת לֵב—a favourite phrase); hence the Mosaic Torah is to be abandoned, since it has proved so ineffective (Jer 31^{32b}).

Jesus, on the other hand, presents us with a much more positive judgment on the Law. His estimate is, further, more conservative. From the beginning the Torah is designed to be temporary, until something higher takes its place. And in truth it contains within itself the principle of love, which is the sum of the law. What is needed is not total abolition, but fulfilment. The old formalism would crumble away, and let the new seed of life spring up. Possibly it never occurred to Jeremiah to relate the old to the new. So far as we can see, he passes away from the Covenant of Sinai without

any sense of its educative or historical value. In practice it has become worthless. Its continuance is an obstacle to vital religion; for it only leads Israel to greater and greater infidelity. Where one side has broken faith so openly, Yahweh cannot be expected to keep His part of the covenant. So the law with all its dangers of externalism is involved in the doom impending Israel. When the New Israel arises phœnix-like out of the ashes of the old, a new law will be brought into being, a better law inscribed not on tables of stone, but on the heart of man.

Some scholars, however, hold that Jeremiah had an interpretation of the Law more closely akin to that of Jesus. Dr. Skinner (*Prophecy and Religion*, p. 332) thus writes: 'To Jeremiah the true Torah of Yahweh is not Deuteronomy, nor any written code, nor priestly oracle, nor prophetic message, but something which has been partly expressed in all these ways, and yet transcends them all—*the revelation of the essential ethical will of God.*' If that were so, why then does he seek to supersede it by the 'inward law'? There is no convincing evidence that he does not use the word תּוֹרָה in any other but the commonly accepted sense. His appeals are based on its ordinary meaning. His complaints are not about the terms of the Mosaic Covenant, but about the way in which the scribes have falsified them. Their lying pens have been at work, and virtually made the law into a lie (Jer 8^{8}). A passage occurs (Jer $7^{21\text{-}23}$) which gives what in Jeremiah's judgment might be an instance of such falsification. The interpretation is difficult, especially in view of the ordinary reading of history. Jeremiah denies that God had ever given Israel any orders about sacrifice at the Exodus. His demand was merely one of moral obedience. Hence this oracle, if it is genuine, condemns the whole ritualistic practice of the nation. The judgment is sweeping, and is opposed to all we now have before us in the *written* codes. It clashes also with other oracles, for instance, with Jer $33^{14\text{-}18}$, where we read of a continuance of David's house, and the permanence of sacrifice: 'Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings,' etc. These passages, however, are written after the fall of the monarchy and are of later date than Jeremiah. The conclusion pressed upon us is that he not only saw the worthlessness of sacrifice separated from a moral life, but also denied its historicity and validity. Ritual had corrupted Yahweh's religion. It had never been commanded at all. Whatever we make of this as a historical statement, it certainly implies that the prophet regarded the moral precepts of the Torah as sufficient to maintain spiritual fellowship with God. The ancient world generally held the opposite opinion. Sacrifice was the essential element in fellowship with the Divine, and morality never entered into the question as vital for the worshipper. The prophet, driven by the excesses of the sacrificial system, was led to utter his sweeping verdict that the original covenant held no such provisions of worship. His famous letter to the exiles in Babylon (Jer 29) bears out this conclusion. Yahweh can be sought and found on a foreign soil as truly as in Judah (Jer $29^{12.\ 13}$). An immediate return was by no means necessary for the practice of the nation's faith. Thus Jeremiah approached near, yet never quite reaches, the universalism of Jesus. He has broken away from localism, and the elaborate priestly ceremonies connected with the Temple. True faith can be expressed without holocausts or other offerings, and in an alien country. But it is still national in form. Jeremiah stops short of the universal outlook, which Christ unfolded to an ignorant peasant woman, pointing forward to the day when neither Jew nor Samaritan could restrict the presence of God to any holy place (Jn 4^{20}).

Can we trace any development in Jeremiah's mind towards this inwardness of the Torah and this step in the direction of universalism? Some interesting attempts have been made; and, if we only knew the precise dates of the various prophecies, we might get at least probable results. Even the question whether the prophet took part in the Deuteronomic reform is a matter of debate. Dr. A. B. Davidson, for example, sees no evidence of his sympathetic participation (see art. 'Jeremiah,' *H.D.B.*: 'A formal championship of Dt would have been very unlike him'). It is not, however, unreasonable to suppose that the prophet had earnest hopes of the reform, and that in the reaction which followed from disappointment he came to see the uselessness of outward law. He became convinced that the required reformation must take place in the heart. Outside events came to reenforce his conviction. Josiah had perished on his rash expedition against Egypt; then followed a recrudescence of idolatrous practices; further,

the political advisers of the king were blind to the international situation; the old eastern corruptions of bribery and oppression were rife. Scarcely one honourable man could be found in Jerusalem (Jer 5^{1}). Making allowance for possible exaggerations, we are compelled to admit that Jeremiah's despair was amply justified. The State was ripe for dissolution. Judah was a vessel doomed to be shattered in pieces. Yahweh's covenant, neglected or distorted or venerated as a fetish, could not save the people. Yet the question still remains, how was it that Jeremiah saw so clearly, while others were in darkness? We must fall back on his view of the covenant-relationship between Yahweh and Israel. This was the category with which he worked. To him the *summum bonum* of life was fellowship with God, and, as we have seen, the fellowship was moral and spiritual. His ideal is a perfect communion with God, which constitutes blessedness. As Yahweh implanted instincts in the migratory birds (Jer 8^{7}), so has He implanted instincts in man's soul for Himself. But He has selected Israel with a special love, and favoured them with a special intimacy. These high privileges are confirmed in a gracious Covenant at Sinai. Sometimes this is referred to as a marriage, where mutual troth is plighted, and a happy honeymoon follows in the desert. Later history presents a sad commentary on the first passionate bridal days.

The point to be noted is, that Jeremiah conceives the covenant or pact dissolved by Israel's infidelity. By a long course of faithlessness Yahweh is set free from the Sinaitic engagement. The agreement then drawn up is at an end. Should God desire, as the prophet believes He does, to make a new covenant, He is no longer bound by the past. He is at liberty to refashion like the potter with the marred clay. The genius of Jeremiah is best displayed in his vision of the future, when the law of the heart displaces the old externalism. That he reached this splendid spiritual conception by stages may be assumed. But just how and when he discarded the popular view, that the Torah was inviolable and imperishable, must remain a matter of uncertainty.

In the mind of Jesus, on the contrary, we find no traces of development. When He first appears in His public ministry, He clearly perceives the relative worth of the Mosaic legislation. While He admits its Divine authority, He does not hesitate to criticize it, and substitute higher precepts. He claims to have authority over it, and puts His 'I say' over against its 'Thou shalt not.' Moreover, behind every rule He reads the principle of love. Jeremiah also reached this 'inward' conception; yet he has not defined, like Christ, this spirit that moves men to spontaneous obedience. Another difference emerges in their estimate of the Temple services. Jesus is more in sympathy with the solemn rites. Despite man's corruption, the Temple was for Him His Father's House. He went into its courts with the multitudes to make holy day. One striking omission on His part appears to have been His non-participation in the sacrifices. Does the silence of the Gospels mean that He never actually offered sacrifice on His own behalf? We never read of any such act. On the other hand, He bade the cleansed lepers show themselves to the priests, and comments on the worthlessness of sacrifice without repentance (Mt $5^{23.\ 24}$). But in the New Covenant which He establishes (Mt 26^{28}, Mk 14^{24}, Lk 22^{20}) He is at one with Jeremiah. Sacrifice disappears as a vehicle of getting into fellowship with God. It belongs to the past economy. The sacrifices of the New Era are transferred to the inner life; they consist of a broken and contrite heart, and not in the shedding of rivers of blood.

The New Society of Jesus completely abandons the nationalism which hampered Jeremiah. The prophet does indeed predict the conversion of the nations, but the subject is not one of prominence. Rather it appears incidentally as a correlative of Yahweh's sovereignty. Israel is the supreme object of Divine care, so that the בְּרִית חֲדָשָׁה is instituted for their sake. No such limitation is found in Christ's διαθήκη. The simple rite of the Sacrament is the outward bond of men everywhere, whose spirits are already united by a common devotion to His person. Jew and Gentile have equal privileges. Nevertheless our Lord's acceptance of Jeremiah's 'covenant' idea proves that He recognized the prophet to have anticipated His own day. Each taught that religion was intuitive, and sprang from the relation of the individual to God. Supreme blessedness consisted in unbroken communion with the Highest. Forgiveness was the seal of this perfect fellowship; moral obedience was its fruits. When the common people compared Jesus to Jeremiah, they were nearer the truth than they knew.

(*To be concluded.*)

Literature.

SEMITIC RELIGIONS.

Of the many excellent volumes which constitute the series of Croall Lectures, there is none which surpasses in interest or importance the lectures on *The Semitic Religions, Hebrew, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem,* which were delivered earlier in the year by Professor David M. Kay, D.S.O., D.D., of St. Andrews, and which have just been published at 7s. 6d. net by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. Professor Kay is a man of many interests, an unusually competent linguist, and a distinguished Semitic scholar; and all his varied powers and knowledge find full scope in this attractive and informing volume.

As is indicated in the Publishers' notice, 'primitive religion, extinct or still alive, has been freely studied in the last generation; but the great Theistic Religions, which have dominated the fifty centuries of unforgotten history, have had less attention.' Or if—in view of the work done by scholars like the late Professor Robertson Smith in this country, the late Professor Wellhausen in Germany, Professors Barton and Moore and many another in America—this is too much to say, it can at least be said that a competent conspectus of those religions, in a form divested of technicality and elaborate detail and intelligible to the average layman, has not often been presented to the public by the experts. Now we have it at last in more than satisfactory form.

Christianity, as the title of the book indicates, is ultimately a Semitic religion; its Founder was a Semite. It is deeply and firmly rooted in the Semitic past; and there is everything to gain when the study of it is undertaken by one who has a full knowledge of its Semitic antecedents. That is why students offered so cordial a welcome to Wellhausen's study of the Gospels, and that is why we listen with special attention to what Professor Kay has to tell us, in successive chapters, on 'Hebrew Religion—Primitive and Prophetic,' 'Hebrew Religion from Cyrus to Vespasian,' 'Judaism,' 'Christianity,' 'The Moslem Religion,' and 'The Heritage and Obligations of Semitic Religion.'

Another reason why this book appeals to us is that it is written in view of urgent modern problems, and inspired by the conviction that the perspective of history illustrates those problems—problems, *e.g.*, like the relation of science to religion, the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, the establishment of material sobriety, and the formation of a League of Nations to avoid war.

From a volume full of interest two points may be singled out as of peculiarly modern interest. (i) In view of the Balfour Declaration, it is instructive to watch how a Semitist like Professor Kay deals with the questions, 'Does Judaism require a national home?' and 'What is the real teaching of the Bible on the possession of Palestine as an essential in Hebrew religion?'

As he rightly says, these questions involve the nature of religion, the constitution of nations, and the principles of international equity. He could not put the case against Zionism better than when he says that '*true religion does not depend on geography,* any more than do philosophy or music or mathematics.' What is the claim of the Jews to Palestine? Is it conquest? The land had not always been theirs; they won it by the sword. But Amos at any rate did not think this a sufficient justification for their being allowed to remain in it for ever. 'The eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth' (9^8). If, in spite of a thousand subsequent political transformations, ancient conquest is adequate justification for the descendants of conquerors cherishing the hope of a later return to the land they conquered, we may still have to reckon with an Italian claim to Britain, which was once Roman. Is the Jewish claim to Palestine really much more reasonable?

We cannot reverse the processes of history. Others are *now* in the land. The Zionists ask the world, as Professor Kay puts it, 'to reinstate them in a national home, *where others already have a national home.*' 'Others, who are equally children of Abraham, who, unlike the ancient Amorite, share the winsome virtues of the Father of the Faithful,—others already have their national home in Palestine.' Further, the nature of true religion, if by that we mean spiritual religion, is inconsistent with emphasis upon locality. 'From the inherent nature of the religion to be provided with a territorial home, it does not appear that its character conforms to modern conceptions of spiritual religion. No

other religion makes a similar claim, and the consensus of mankind would agree in rejecting a demand for territory in the name of religion.' 'All that can wisely be offered to Judaism in Palestine is a spiritual home, such as has contented other great communions for centuries.'

(ii) In the last chapter Professor Kay deals with the League of Nations. He has nothing to say about machinery. That is important, indeed indispensable, but he goes deeper than that to the necessity for the transformation of individual character, and this is effected by the prophetic religion, working through Synagogue, Church, and Mosque. This religion 'tempers patriotism by including citizens of many nations in a wider spiritual fellowship. The hope of eternal life enables its possessors to accept more easily a temporal disadvantage for the good of others. Among individuals it generates the hope of reform through penitence.'

Professor Kay's study of *The Semitic Religions* can hardly fail to provoke wide and fruitful discussion.

WESLEYAN METHODISM.

Dr. John S. Simon has followed up his volume on 'John Wesley and the Religious Societies' by one on *John Wesley and the Methodist Societies* (The Epworth Press; 18s. net). It is a big book but it is not a bit too big for its subject or for its readers. Dr. Simon continues his story of the rise of Wesleyanism a stage beyond its origins. We see how great were the difficulties the Wesleys had to face, difficulties so great that the progress of the Movement is nothing short of a miracle. There was the queer 'stillness' heresy among the sectaries, which was anti-church and anti-everything. Even Charles Wesley was for a time seduced by it. Then there were the doctrinal disputes over Calvinism and other 'isms.' There were personal jealousies. There were the strange misrepresentations of the Wesleys and their aims. They were widely regarded as agents for the Pretender, for example. But the gravest trouble was the fierce and cruel opposition of the clergy and the mob. Amid all these waves of a stormy sea John Wesley steered a straight course, and we are impressed deeply as we read the story again with the sanity, the courage, the patience, the love and the dogged perseverance of the man.

But the main interest of this book is that it traces all that Methodism has become to its sources. We watch Wesley laying the foundations of the Methodist Church. We see how the 'classes' began, and the local preachers, and the stewards, and the Conference. It is a commonplace to say that Wesleyanism created a new England. But what can never be commonplace is the genius of the man who was its prophet—his genius and his saintliness. The whole story is told by Dr. Simon with a pen that never fails to trace for us pictures and scenes that fascinate and move us. It is a great story and it is well told. It may be hoped that Dr. Simon will go on and complete the history.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Two essays by the late Canon Scott Holland on the Fourth Gospel have been published, with some additional matter, under the title *The Fourth Gospel* (Murray; 6s. net). They are introduced by Bishop Gore, who makes a remark which is amply borne out by the recent biography of Dr. Scott Holland. He says that the intellectual world took the Canon too lightly. In point of fact no man of his generation had a more penetrating intellect. This was also the opinion of T. H. Green. And when such a mind sets itself to the study of St. John there are certain to be valuable results.

Such an anticipation is amply borne out by these essays, of which Dr. Armitage Robinson says that they are the most important contribution of recent times to the discussion of the Johannine problem. Dr. Scott Holland looks at the question with his own eyes, and his argument is a fresh and suggestive one. He points out, first, that the Synoptics do not explain or account for their own facts. There is the Lord's sinlessness, *e.g.*, and there is His towering supremacy over the Baptist, and there is His obvious authority. The Synoptics do not account for any of these things. Nor do they account for the actual religion that adopted the story as its own, the religion of those who were 'in Christ' and 'in the Spirit,' and were at the same time believers in a universal gospel.

This was the religion that set out to convert the world and that had the Synoptic records in its hands. But they do not explain it. The Jesus of Harnack's criticism has no relationship to the creed that arose in His name. It is obvious that the Synoptics had a limited intention, to tell what happened before Christianity, as a religion, was actually born. It was born at the Resurrection,

but the Synoptics only set out to tell the story of the earthly career. It needed another Gospel to explain the facts, and therefore the Fourth Gospel is a religious necessity of the situation.

But it is also a historical necessity. It is perfectly clear that Jesus exercised a ministry in Judæa before He went to Galilee. Several facts prove this. The ministry of Galilee was one of *flight*. He retired to Galilee because He had been driven from Judæa. The Pharisees are already hostile when Jesus appears in Galilee. They follow Him down from Jerusalem. This is unintelligible apart from a Judæan ministry. Further, the calling of the first disciples is unintelligible without an earlier ministry.

What, again, is the explanation of the Lord's certainty that as soon as He goes to Jerusalem He will die there? How, again, explain the words of Jesus in which He sadly deplores the misuse by Jerusalem of her opportunity? She had had her 'day.' He had made His offer, and it had been rejected. When had this chance been given her? 'How often would I have gathered thy children,' says Jesus. When?

Further, the Synoptics themselves supply evidence of a ministry in Judæa when they tell of devoted disciples, friends, lovers whom Jesus already possesses in the city which they have never told of His having visited—the Bethany home, the man with the colt, the man who provided the upper room.

It is this earlier ministry which explains a great deal of the Synoptic story. But it also satisfies our natural and reasonable expectation that One who set Himself to evoke Messianic hopes and announce the Coming of the Kingdom should deliver His message in a spot sacred to the tradition of the King. It would be strange if He who wept over the city had never sought to win it.

THE BANYANKOLE.

Hot foot upon the first, Canon Roscoe has issued the second part of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa. It is in every way worthy of the earlier volume; and those who have read *The Bakitara* know that that is high praise indeed. One could not wish to handle a finer piece of first-hand work than *The Banyankole* (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net). No scholar in this sphere can afford to overlook it; and to ordinary readers it is probably at least as interesting as its predecessor. Everywhere one has the comfortable feeling that one is in the hands of a master, who has taken pains to derive his material from uncontaminated sources, and who is eminently sane in his handling of them.

He is here dealing with a comparatively small but very ancient people, or rather two peoples—the pastoral conquerors and the agricultural serfs. There are numerous chiefs, from whom there is the right of appeal to the Mugabe, or king, who never grows old, but, when his powers begin to fail, takes poison and dies.

Religion has been only slightly organized, the Creator, and even the lesser gods who stand closer to men, being somewhat shadowy figures; the really impressive personalities in the Unseen are the ghosts, who play a large part in the people's lives. One gathers that the ghost of an ordinary man is apt to be reborn in his grandchild, but a king becomes a lion, his mother a leopard, and his sister a python, these last transmigrations taking place after peculiarly repulsive funeral rites. But indeed all their ceremonies after death seem odd from our angle of vision. Thus it is dishonouring to be buried in clean earth. The seemly place of interment is the dung-heap.

Here and there familiar things loom up through the strangeness of that alien life. A man may not marry a younger sister while an elder is unwed; and a pious kind of fraud seems to have been devised to get round the awkwardness in certain cases. A suicide, acting without obvious cause, is buried on waste ground. An heir literally waits for a dead man's shoes, and puts them on as the sign of entering into possession of his new estate.

But much is ugly and unhappy. Thus, while moral purity is carefully preserved until marriage, thereafter both sexes are openly and frankly and unblushingly promiscuous, to an almost incredible degree. And the budding woman's life is most unhealthy. Taken from their free romps with the boys, girls are secluded and fattened for marriage—for the stouter a woman is the greater beauty is she thought to be—until the poor creatures can only waddle, and sit when dancing, only moving their arms and swaying the upper portions of their bodies.

Still there is much that seems enviable; the independence of the herdsmen, the facts that there are no jails, that even to bind a criminal is held

to be too dishonouring to a man, that the usual punishment is a fine; or this, that a soldier who has slain an enemy in war is treated as a murderer who must purify himself; or, to name yet two more, the ease with which land can be acquired and held, and the care with which the poor provide for their parents, and rich relatives for unsuccessful folk—so much so that if a rich man leaves a brother unhelped, no one dreams of attending his funeral, the idea being that this results in him in turn being born poor and helpless elsewhere.

This is an interesting and informing book.

JESUS AND JUDAISM.

The aim of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Walker's elaborate book on *The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) is to 'make Jesus better known.' His real originality can never be known completely from the Gospels, it can be rightly appreciated only through the medium of a comparison between His teaching and the teaching of His contemporaries and immediate predecessors or successors. This is exactly what Dr. Walker has sought to do, and has done with great success. He has examined with meticulous care the extra-canonical literature of the period 200 B.C.–A.D. 100, more particularly with regard to its teaching on God, the Kingdom, the Messiah, Man, Salvation, and the Hereafter. He has allowed the writers to speak for themselves; and then he discusses with similar care the teaching of Jesus on these topics. At the end of each chapter both types of teaching are summarized in a lucid paragraph, so that Dr. Walker has made the task of comparison as easy as it can be made. In addition, he has quoted very freely from modern Jewish and Christian writers on the period, criticizing both in a spirit of real independence. He is not afraid on occasion to cross swords with experts like Mr. Montefiore.

The knowledge and temper of the writer have combined to give us an eminently just book. We are glad to notice that his careful study, like that of Mr. Montefiore's recent 'Old Testament and After,' obliges us to modify some prevalent misconceptions of Judaism. We must henceforth speak with more reserve, he reminds us, of 'the frigidness of legalism.' We have too readily assumed its 'all-round pessimism.' Its representatives were men of prayer; they believed, more than we have been ready to admit, in the love that will not let the sinner go; and to them the Sabbath was a real delight, a day on which fasting, for example, was forbidden. Dr. Walker even goes so far as to suggest that 'whether or not Jesus had fully worked out His idea of the Fatherhood of God in reference to the Beyond, there is little doubt as to what that full working out should be'—a statement which he later explains by remarking that 'the idea of the Fatherhood of God, if it is worked out consistently, shuts out the idea of final doom altogether, for—quoting Dr. J. H. Leckie—"when we think of his doctrine that God is love, we see that it involves the universality and everlasting persistence of divine grace."' Doubtless there is another side to this, as Dr. Walker is well aware: but this statement illustrates the fearless and challenging, as well as the informative, character of this educative book. A minor challenging touch is Dr. Walker's criticism of the φλόξ of which the rich man complains in the place of torment (Lk 16^{24}): this he regards not as the flame of fire, but as burning fever, 'a hitherto unobserved medical use of the term in Luke.'

Dr. Walker may be honestly congratulated on having succeeded in his aim of making Jesus better known.

PRIMITIVE MENTALITY.

Professor Lucien Lévy-Bruhl has given us another of his fascinating studies of the primitive mind, which has been translated by Lilian A. Clare. For fascinating it is, leading us far away into a strange uncanny world, where secondary causes have small meaning, and in which there is no chance or accident, no time or space as we conceive them, into an eerie place full of mystic powers and forces always there, and very often very obvious to those primitive minds, which therefore, declares the Professor, for all their seeming stupidity, and their inability to reason or to see cause and effect, really live in a world which, in some ways, is a bigger and more wonderful world than ours. That is a characteristic remark. For it is not merely the mass of facts gathered from every quarter on such themes as dreams and divination and omens and ordeals and very much else of that nature that give the book its value, but even more the sanity of mind with which these are used, and the seemingly inevitable conclusions that are drawn from them. All kinds of folk will find here some-

thing touching on their interests. Spiritualists, for example, will find a page or two upon clairvoyance (p. 217, or p. 84 f.), where we are told that a recently dead married man will speak through the medium of an old woman and say: 'I am So-and-so speaking,' and declare his wishes. But if these are unreasonable, they are not binding on survivors, who say bluntly, 'He is mad.' That is a fact which seems to indicate that the primitive mind has something it can teach some more civilized people who have ventured back into its province. *Primitive Mentality* (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net) is, in a way, a somewhat dreadful book, revealing, as it does, how uncertain is the world in which masses of our fellow-men still live, seeing that at any moment a dream or an ant, or the pointing of a stick, or any one of a thousand things, may involve one in preposterous charges and inevitable doom. Yet even more disquieting is the thought that will keep rising up within the mind. Here are multitudes of people taking as axiomatic what we know to be quite palpably untrue, and is there any certainty that we, too, may not be moving in a like vain show, lost in the mists, and clinging to mere fantasies as proved unanswerable obvious facts?

ANCIENT EGYPT.

When so much attention is being focused on Egypt, a new book by Sir William M. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt* (Constable; 6s. net), is sure of a warm welcome even though, as the preface informs us, the book under review must be looked on as the outline of part of a more serious work, the 'Descriptive Sociology of Egypt,' which is to appear shortly.

This volume is therefore to be taken as 'a repast drawn from the storehouse,' and the storehouse in the case of Professor Petrie is so amply furnished that we are in no danger of a sketchy meal. The account given is a very readable and interesting review of life in Ancient Egypt, dealing with nearly every phase except the religious. And a companion volume on Religious Life in Egypt is promised.

There is nothing about Tutankhamen in the book, but to make up for this there are one or two instructive criticisms of British policy in Egypt. Professor Flinders Petrie shows how Western improvements grafted on to the life of a people so stationary in many respects as the Egyptians may not always have the most satisfactory results. In dealing with the irrigation of the Nile Valley he says: 'This basin irrigation has lasted down to our time, and has only been abolished in favour of perennial canal irrigation in the last few years. The effect is not quite satisfactory; the people have not the habit of control needed for the new system; they let the high-level supply run too long and raise the water-table in the soil, so that cotton suffers by water-logging, and a field is often useless by being flooded when it should be in full crop.'

THE VEDIC HYMNS.

'The Heritage of India' Series proceeds upon its useful way. The spirit of its publications is, of course, admirable; and, joined to that, there is a happy knack of choosing really vital subjects and committing them to wholly competent hands. Here is a small but representative selection of *Hymns from the Rigveda* (Oxford University Press; 2s. 6d. net), translated by Professor A. A. Macdonell of Oxford, with an informing little essay and full and useful notes on the various deities to whom the hymns chosen are addressed—the whole making a valuable introduction to the subject.

It is true that to most minds there is something just a little wooden in the Vedic Hymns; and it would be an exaggeration to say that this translation altogether removes that impression. And yet these somewhat naive personifications of natural forces, Vāta the wind, Agni the fire, Āpas the waters, Rudra the thunderstorm, Uṣas the dawn, the Aśvins the half light and the half dark, and the rest, not to speak of the mighty Indra and the compassionate Varuna, are they not near of kin to St. Francis' Canticle of the Sun with its 'our brother the fire' and 'our sister water,' who is 'meek and serviceable'? Did not these old singers too walk the earth lost in the same awe and the same gratitude, and the same spirit of worship, whereas we, as Wordsworth cried out in a kind of agony, tramp flatfootedly and heavily through all the wonder, and see nothing at all!

And when one remembers that the Vedic text has been preserved with 'unparalleled fidelity' since 600 B.C., and that the oldest of the hymns have come down more than 3000 years, surely something grips us like that which Carlyle felt when, musing over an old letter of Cromwell's

days, he cried out, 'And they really came down to breakfast that morning; and they are gone like the flowers that blossomed that summer, like the birds that sang in its branches!'

The path of those that have gone by she follows,
The first of endless dawns to come hereafter.
The living at her rising she arouses;
The dead she never wakens from their slumber.

Gone are those mortals who in former ages
Beheld the flushing of the early morning;
We living men now look upon her shining:
Those will be born who shall hereafter see her.

The goddess Dawn has flushed in former ages,
And here to-day the bounteous maiden flushes:
So also may she flush in days hereafter.
With powers her own she fares, immortal, ageless.

Or that cry in a funeral hymn for one dead and forgotten as though he had never been, how very long ago.

Wide open, earth, O press not heavily on him;
Be easy of approach to him, a refuge safe;
As with a robe a mother hides
Her son, so shroud this man, O earth.

'The necessary condition of inspiration,' we are told by Mr. G. A. Gaskell in the Introduction to his elaborate *Dictionary of the Sacred Language of All Scriptures and Myths* (Allen & Unwin; 42s. net), 'is that the inspired writer is unaware of the theme on which he is writing, and therefore irresponsible for either the words or the meaning.' And, as the higher criticism 'destroys entirely the old belief in verbal inspiration,' the Scriptures are treated by its representatives as 'rubbish more or less, according to the fancies of the impious critics.' The better way, it appears, is to treat the language of the Scriptures as cryptic, and this Dictionary, which regards the words with which it deals as symbolic of something else, is offered as the key—confessedly inadequate, as the work is 'difficult and arduous pioneer work.' Thus Aaron is 'a symbol of the spiritual mind, the inner mind which is moved by the higher emotions.' The Feeding of the Five Thousand is 'a symbol of instruction and knowledge given to the numerous lower qualities of the soul, by means of the senses and subtle perceptions (fishes) of the astro-physical body.' The Marks of Jesus are 'a symbol of the intuitions of the causal-body which is the vehicle of the Higher Self.' And so on. All the great religious systems, from Buddhism to Swedenborgianism, are taken into account, and most of the articles are illustrated by quotations from a wide variety of sources ancient or modern, including writers like Stopford Brooke and R. J. Campbell. We fear that those who are convinced of the legitimacy and necessity of historico-critical study will find little to edify them here. 'I venture to say,' says the writer, 'that there is no conceivable solution of the problems of Religions and Scriptures than the one set forth, however inadequately, in this Dictionary.' If this be so, then God help His poor bewildered humanity in their struggle towards the light.

Among the many books on problems of education, interested readers should not overlook Miss Margaret McMillan's *Education through the Imagination* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). So great an authority as Mr. J. L. Paton of Manchester Grammar School gives it his blessing in a preface. He says that the greatest indictment of our present educational system is that it quenches the ideal, the light in the soul. And it is as a corrective to this that he praises Miss McMillan's book as 'a book of hope and endeavour.' The subject is the development of the best in the child, and in successive chapters the writer deals with the growth of imagination through nature, memory, emotion, handwork, the home, drawing, and sound. There is a great deal of wisdom in these chapters, and a great deal of experience. But the best thing in any of them is what is in all of them—a healthy view of what the child is, and of how the child may grow to something better. It is a book of 'hope and endeavour.'

The Rev. F. W. Norwood, D.D., of the City Temple, London, has published as 'the first effort' of his pen a series of Sunday morning addresses which were given to the children of his congregation during his Australian ministry. He has called the volume *Sunshine and Wattlegold* (Allenson; 5s. net). The young people at home may not know what 'Wattlegold' means, so the preacher will have the advantage of telling them what it means in Australia, and so with other

allusions in these addresses. But young people in Australia are just like those at home, and Dr. Norwood's addresses contain many admirable illustrations.

How wide is the gulf that separates the Roman Catholic from the Protestant attitude to Scripture is very evident in Mr. H. J. T. Johnson's little volume on *Anthropology and the Fall* (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Johnson is a trained anthropologist, thoroughly versed in the story, so far as it is at present known, of early man. But he maintains that none of our knowledge of this story, so far as it is real knowledge and not merely inference, is inconsistent with the Catholic doctrines that the human race is descended from a single pair of human ancestors, that it fell from a state of primeval innocence through the sin of its first parents, and that in consequence of that sin each member of the race has lost the supernatural gifts which were destined as man's heritage. The writer admits that Science cannot prove these things, and that for the belief in them we must rely on Revelation. The Catholic believes that the Church can settle certain questions which lie beyond the scope of investigation. 'The Bible is not its own interpreter, but possesses an infallible interpreter in the Church.' 'It belongs,' we are told, 'to the province of the theologian no less to tell us the scope of the primitive revelation than the scope of that made by Jesus Christ.' But this is surely to equate two things of widely different importance. For the revelation of Jesus Christ we have something not far removed from contemporary evidence: for the so-called facts of primitive revelation there is and there can be no evidence worthy of the name. 'The message of the prophets,' says Professor Kay in his recent 'Semitic Religions,' 'does not depend on any particular theory of the remote past.' No more does the message of Jesus.

The Acts of the Apostles, by the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, B.D. (4s. 6d. net), is the first instalment of a new Commentary to be called 'The Clarendon Bible.' The Commentary is edited by the Bishops of Newcastle and Ripon and is being issued by the Clarendon Press. The aim of 'The Clarendon Bible' is to put forward 'a constructive view of the books and their teaching, taking into consideration and welcoming results as to which there is a large measure of agreement among scholars.' The books are to be placed in their historical context, so that as far as possible 'the sense which they bore when written' may be recovered.

Mr. Blunt, in the volume on 'Acts,' has succeeded admirably in carrying out the editors' intentions. In addition to the actual Commentary and to numerous illustrations, there are four essays on 'The Spirit,' 'The Jewish Messianic Hope,' 'The Decree of Acts 15 and its results,' and 'Paul and Judaism,' and a valuable general Introduction, which runs to fifty pages. We look forward to further volumes.

The George H. Doran Company have published a volume of sermons by Rev. John Timothy Stone, D.D., LL.D., pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago. The title is *Places of Quiet Strength* ($2.00 net).

The latest volume in the George H. Doran Company's 'One Hundred' Series is *One Hundred Best Sermons for Special Days and Occasions* ($2.50 net). The sermons have been compiled and edited by the Rev. G. B. F. Hallock, D.D. Some of the occasions are not commemorated here, as Lincoln's Birthday and Washington's Birthday, but the volume contains also sermons for the important feasts of the Christian Year. Illustrations for the special days are a feature.

Fifty Short Sermons by the Rev. T. De Witt Talmage have been compiled by his daughter and published by the George H. Doran Company ($1.50 net).

'To-day the young people dominate the situation. . . . In the Church there never was a time when they commanded so much sincere attention and solicitude.' It is with this conviction that the Rev. G. Beesley Austin has published a series of what he terms 'Studies in the Great Simplicities,' under the title *Beautiful Gates in Life* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). These are not pulpit addresses or children's sermons, but the substance of addresses for young people. Mr. Austin writes out of a well-informed mind. He knows what he wants to say and says it in crisp sentences, as these: 'Bad thoughts create bad acts. A corrupt soul is the fertile hotbed of a thousand unholy deeds. An evil that is nourished in a man's heart at last

writes itself out upon every feature of his face. It cannot finally be hid. Remorselessly the malign power travels from the centre of life to its widest circumference, and at last involves all in fearful degradation and overthrow. And, contrariwise, a good desire may seem a feeble thing, but if it persists it will triumph over every obstacle, and lift a whole life into its beauty and invest it with its strength.'

There are few who will dispute that a wise evangelism is one of the crying needs of the time. The Rev. Lionel B. Fletcher has himself had much experience, and in *The Effective Evangelist* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s. net) he endeavours to instruct us how to avoid mistakes and dangers, and proceed so as to make it likely, so far as under God that can be done, that those outside will be really reached and won. For he is sure of this, and most people are coming to agree with him, that the ideal is that every minister should be his own evangelist, and that many who hang back diffidently from a work for which they think themselves unfitted might be doing signal service if they would only try. His aim and purpose is to show us how to try, and he does it with earnestness and some minuteness. It is a book that may well reawaken hope in some discouraged by the fact that hitherto the most happy and glorious experiences of the ministry have seemed to be denied them, and to lie very largely out of their eager reach. Still, after all, in a large house there are all kinds of vessels, all of them serviceable each in its own way ; and in the Church God chooses some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, all for the perfecting of the saints. Quite so, Mr. Fletcher would agree, but he would add, Only are you quite sure that you have heard God's call to you aright ? And it is well that we should think it out again.

Is there really any need at this time of day for a book to prove that many of the greatest minds in literature and science and the like have been devout Christian believers, and that the faith has been the well-head out of which has flowed much of the very noblest music and art and poetry, that the culture of the race would have been an infinitely poorer thing without it ? Perhaps there is. For no one who has ever faced a crowd upon the streets, where heckling was allowed after the address, but knows what crude and dark and unbelievable ideas lurk in many minds. Mr. John G. Bowran in his *Christianity and Culture* (Holborn Publishing House ; 5s. net) tells us, however, that he writes rather for the young in the churches ; and, admitting the boundlessness of his theme, he allows that to do justice to it a whole series of bulky volumes would hardly suffice. His own, while interesting, is something of a medley, inasmuch as it is not always evident why this and that are chosen, and other things, as obvious and apposite or more, omitted. There is a mass of quotation skilfully used. But such glimpses as we get of it suggest that one would like to see more of the mind of the author himself.

Practically every one admits the supremacy of the Jew in Religion, but his contribution to Jurisprudence, which is very substantial, is not so familiar. How profound and valuable this contribution is will be very clear to any one who takes the trouble to study the painstaking and detailed account of *The Jewish Law of Agency with Special Reference to the Roman and the Common Law,* by Israel Herbert Levinthal, D.H.L. (The Jewish Theological Seminary of America). He deals with the subject ' as understood in the modern law under the headings of principal and agent and master and servant.' The subject is an intricate one, and its inherent difficulties are enhanced by the fact that the Talmud is not a systematic treatise, and that it deals with many things besides law. The facts have therefore to be extricated from a wide area. Here they are not only extricated but systematized, and the result is to convince us afresh of the essentially just and practical quality of the Jewish mind.

We do not understand what induced Mr. C. Y. C. Dawbarn, M.A., to call his book *Applied Philosophy* (Longmans ; 5s. net), unless he followed the saying, ' a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.' The author does not believe in philosophy, and from his 330 pages we can gather little to apply. He believes in ' intelligent selfishness ' and ' creedless Christianity ' and ' physical science ' as the things that are to solve all sorts of problems. Painting with a large brush he epitomizes nearly all world-history. The contrary conclusions to his, however, might easily be drawn. Some good aphorisms occur.

A short but eminently readable life of Bishop

Selwyn has been written by Mrs. Creighton. The title is *G. A. Selwyn, D.D.* (Longmans ; 5s. net).

When a librarian browses among the books of his own library he should have something interesting to tell us. And that is what has happened with the librarian of the Unitarian College Library in Manchester. In a little volume, *The Story of a Nonconformist Library* (Longmans ; 7s. 6d. net), Dr. H. M'Lachlan tells the story of this institution lovingly and in detail. He then proceeds to give us some glimpses of the insides of the books, notes on their authors and their readers, examples of pencilled comments and other interesting matter. But he goes beyond these things and recalls much of value about the Nonconformity of a hundred years ago, in essays on old controversies and nearly forgotten sects. A very delightful book.

Assyrian made attractive to the student may justly be claimed by the author of *Assyrian Grammar*, Dr. Samuel A. B. Mercer (Luzac ; 8s.). In each chapter exercises are supplied, this being the distinctive feature of the grammar. The Chrestomathy, Sign-List, and Glossary form the second half of the text-book. It is the work of one who has been specially equipped by experience of teaching, and who possesses the gift of being able to keep his students steadily in view. The book is attractive in another way, and on this the publishers are to be congratulated. A singular feature is the final page of Corrigenda, where mistakes, most of them in the formation of Assyrian signs, are given. All these pertain to the exercises.

The Great Harvester (Stanley Martin ; 2s. 6d. net) is the title of a volume of addresses by the Rev. A. Douglas Brown. Mr. Stuart Holden writes a foreword in which he says : 'Whatever be the text of the address, the subject is always Christ ; and hence the Divine authentication of his words, which has made high place for him amongst the most successful evangelists and teachers of our day.'

In *The Early Syriac Lectionary System* (Milford ; 4s. net) we have 'quite the earliest liturgical monument of Syriac Christianity that is preserved in approximate completeness. It shows us how Syriac-speaking Christians of the fifth and early sixth centuries heard the Holy Scriptures read.' A document of such importance has had long to wait for an editor, but now one has been found—Dr. F. C. Burkitt—and the result is all that could be desired. The essential matter is presented in a readily accessible form, but it is evident that a much more ambitious plan might have been followed. The single page of MS facsimile appended reveals the extent of the concentration. The introductory pages and the survey of the general characteristics of *Lect.* (the abbreviation used), following the translation, are of supreme interest, emphasis being laid throughout upon the marks of antiquity. A great amount of labour has also been expended on the collation of *Lect.* with similar notices in ancient Syriac Biblical MSS. It may safely be predicted that this publication will frequently be referred to by future students within this field.

How amazingly beautiful and moving are the Gospel stories of Christ's Resurrection life, so beautiful that many are afraid to preach on them, lest they should soil them, or lest, at their rude touch, the perfect petals should fall. Yet the Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., greatly daring, has written *The Story of the Resurrection* (Murray ; 7s. 6d. net) ; and he has done it reverently and well. More than once he tells us that his own mind is hurt by a certain undue familiarity with which many excellent people speak of Jesus Christ. There is in his book a seemliness of spirit, in presence of our Lord, for which one is grateful. Those who are stumbled by the Resurrection facts will, perhaps, not be helped much by this work. For the Dean has himself no difficulties. He is of opinion that our faith in those facts 'rests on an extraordinarily strong foundation, even from the mere human point of view, apart from the question of the inspiration of the Evangelists' : and he rejects all modernist interpretations as entirely inadequate. The studies are devotional, always reverent and devout, and sometimes really vivid, revealing, as in the fine chapter on Mary Magdalene, eyes that see many things that are too often overlooked, and left in shadow.

An illustrated edition has been published by the Religious Tract Society of *The Harvest of a Quiet Eye*, by the Rev. J. R. Vernon, M.A. (6s. net).

The famous Conference of 'Modern Churchmen'

at Girton some years ago has given rise to not a little controversy. The publication of its proceedings was duly noted in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and an account given of the main positions assumed. The Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., has been moved by the Modernist publication to make a reasoned reply, and he does so in a small book with an excellent temper and a great deal of force. The book is called *Modernism and the Person of Christ* (Robert Scott; 3s. 6d. net), and it forms one of the 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice.' We can confidently recommend the book as a competent and persuasive statement of the Catholic doctrine on a point which is central to the faith of the Church.

The interest in problems of eschatology is clearly widespread. Books are continually issuing from the Press on one aspect or another of this question. Not all of these are by professional theologians. The layman occasionally takes his turn, and he does so in *The Riddle of Life after Death*, by Mr. F. Attfield Fawkes (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). The standpoint is that of conditional immortality, which seems to be popular at present. But the book takes a wider range and discusses the whole outlook on the future. One quaint idea is that man may be used by God in the unseen world as an instrument in the process of creation which is constantly going on.

The Student Christian Movement is to be congratulated on the series of letters from medical missionaries which it has published. The title is *Medical Practice in Africa and the East* (4s. net). The object of the book is to give some idea of how Christ is working, and calling others to work with Him, through the medical profession abroad.

Glorifying Christ: A Meditation.

By the Reverend W. S. Urquhart, D.Litt., Officiating Principal, Scottish Churches College, Calcutta.

'As always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death.

'For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.'

Ph 1[20. 21].

If these verses are to be properly understood, they must be taken in connexion with one another and interpreted in the light of the whole passage in which they occur. St. Paul is not instituting a contrast between life and death. His central thought is that Christ is to be glorified whether by life *or* by death, and it is a thought which stretches right across the gulf which separates between life and death. There is no death for those whose life is Christ; there is only *life*, here and now, and fuller life hereafter; gain, not loss; development, not catastrophe; victory, not defeat. There is no morbid longing for death in this passage. Death might, in certain moods and circumstances, have an attractiveness for Paul, as an escape from almost intolerable misery, but it could be gain in the full sense only if it followed upon doing the will of God. That this will should be done, that Christ should be magnified, is the dominating idea. All else is background, material rather for personal desire than for dedicated purpose.

It seems to me that much harm has been done to Christian thought and life through isolating and emphasizing the last words of our text, 'to die is gain.' And when they are once separated from the words 'to live is Christ,' they are easily associated with the verse which occurs later in the passage, 'having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.' Thus the wrong impression of these words of intrinsic beauty goes deep. It leads to the sickly other-worldliness which has often been associated with Christianity, to the setting up of an unhealthy ideal of impossible detachment. It fosters a contempt for the value of this life as compared with the next, and encourages, even at the sacrifice of present duties, a relaxing of the soul, in contemplative anticipation of a future world where palm branches and golden crowns and a persistent singing of hymns are the prominent features.

This present life suffers by the comparison. Its perfectly healthy and harmless joys are despised

or frowned upon. The privileges of friendship and the inspirations of fellowship are neglected. The necessity for courtesy and good manners—which are the outward signs of a properly sympathetic interest in other people—is overlooked, and the duty of social service is sacrificed to the pursuit of a purely individual salvation. Our present existence is represented as a dreary wilderness journey through which we take our lonely and painful way. We have to *pass through* it—that is all—and the sooner we are done with it the better. We may, indeed, see a light on the far distant horizon of the future, but darkness is all around us at the present, and the forms of our fellows hover around us like shadowy ghosts in the gloom.

This is an unfortunate attitude to life, and there is no justification for it in our text. It is akin to the idea of salvation which is to be found in much of the religious literature, *e.g.*, of India—a view according to which salvation is simply deliverance or escape or running away from the cares and anxieties of human existence instead of an emphasis upon growing healthiness or completeness of life both in the present and in the future. A similar spirit inspired the monasticism of early Christianity when the would-be saints withdrew themselves to solitary contemplation, and, despising the opportunities of this present life, left the wicked world to its foolish and futile ways. Certain sentimental stories which were exceedingly popular two or three decades ago owed much to this idea—stories of early death-beds of model youths and maidens whom we were invited to admire chiefly because of their overwhelming desire to get away to another world.

And we still sing hymns which, though otherwise beautiful, are largely spoiled by the intrusion of this over-cultivated other-worldliness. It is difficult to listen without a certain sense of dismay to children singing with apparent gusto, 'Earth is a desert drear, heaven is my home,' and one can only hope that they are not fully aware of the meaning of the words, though in general we would urge that it is advisable that both old and young should praise the Lord with understanding. In many broader ways, also, this attitude to life is responsible for a melancholy which overspreads the countenance and paralyses the activity of estimable Christians, creating a gloominess of spirit which seems utterly alien to the spirit of the Christ.

No doubt St. Paul, as he lay in his loathsome prison, often felt that life had little more to offer him in the way of comfort and peace, and occasionally he may have intensely desired to get away from it all. No doubt, also, he wished to comfort others in similar circumstances whose courage was slight, who, like him, saw death approaching very near, but, unlike him, were full of fears. He wished to strengthen them by pointing out that death was no calamity, but might even be a gain. It was well in such a situation to cherish this consoling thought, and even to allow that death might be more attractive than life.

But we must on no account lose sight of St. Paul's fundamental thought which he expresses in our text taken as a whole. Even in the worst of worldly circumstances death could be really attractive only if it were in accordance with the will of God. Christ must be magnified whether by life or by death. Even if death might bring added happiness, men must not dwell on that happiness apart from considerations of the will of God. St. Paul himself had a desire to escape from the misery and hardship which seemed to be all he had to look for, and he frankly confesses this desire—'having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.' But he puts the thought away from him, or rather he puts it under the control of the far larger and nobler thought that Christ must be magnified whether by life *or* by death. Similarly, even if it consoled his hearers to think of the uninterrupted and blissful communion with Christ which lay beyond the grave, they must not allow this thought to be uppermost in their minds. If they did so, they would miss the happiness they expected. Notwithstanding all the blessedness that might be awaiting them, if they witnessed a good confession, they could not face even a martyr's death in the right spirit if they were not *willing* to live on in the present life even under the most terrible conditions of hardship and pain. No longing for death was permissible if it was the will of God that they should live. Even at the sacrifice of immediate personal bliss Christ must be magnified whether by life or by death.

Now we can never know that death is the will of God for us until it comes; therefore we must not dwell on the thought of it. In mystical moods of rapt religious devotion, or after a life of long continued and physically hopeless suffering, death may become attractive—so attractive as to arouse a longing for it. But its actual coming is outside of

our control. We have nothing to do with it; it comes by the will of God or it comes not at all. It is for us, therefore, to concentrate our thoughts on *life*. Life, not death, is the will of God for us, so long as we are alive. We are called to live in the fullest possible way for the glory of God and of Christ, watching for every opportunity for the service of our fellows and the hastening of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

St. Paul is ready for either death or life. He is not afraid of death, and he may even have had a personal and passing desire for this method of release from his present difficulties. But he refuses to concentrate his thoughts on death or view it in the light of an escape to private happiness. His attention is turned to the opportunities and duties of this present life, and, if it is more needful for others that he should remain in life, if his abiding would be for the furtherance of their faith, he is willing, perfectly willing, to remain. To him to live is Christ, and to die would be gain *only* if he were first of all willing to live in the spirit of Christ. To say that death is gain does not mean that death is put in contrast with and preferred to the best human life which we may now live according to the will of God. The comparison is not between the living, which is Christ, and the death, which is gain. Rather the verse, when taken in connexion with the context, means that the 'gainful' death is to be regarded as a continuation, supplement, or completion of this present life in Christ, as a consequence which can emerge only if we are willing to live this best of all lives here and now. We shall never grasp this gain which lies in death if we are turning away from the present in order to lose ourselves in contemplation of the mystical joy which lies beyond, if we are unwilling to live strenuously, completely, joyously, and unselfishly now and so long as God shall continue our span of mortal life. Even the martyr, from whom all hope of escape has been taken away and to whom the few hours that remain can bring nothing but agony, does not really choose death. He chooses the kind of life which may lead to death, not death itself. He does not foreclose the issue; there is always the possibility that deliverance may come even at the last moment, a deliverance which, probably from a personal point of view, he does not desire. But he is ready for either result, refusing to decide the event, even mentally, by concentrating his thoughts on death, and choosing life with its double possibility. And at all times and everywhere the Christian is called by the voice of Christ and all His true followers to a meditation upon life and not upon death, to a constant endeavour to learn more fully the secret of life, and to draw more constantly and hopefully from the eternal sources of spiritual power.

The thought of our text leaves us with a message both of warning and of comfort. Those who are most vividly conscious of the deceitfulness of the human heart may say that, if we concentrate our attention wholly upon life and put death in the background of our minds, we may be tempted to take very short views and allow ourselves to be controlled by the motive of present gain. If we put death too much out of sight, it may find us unprepared and come upon us as an overwhelming catastrophe. But this will not happen if we keep in mind the fundamental principle, 'to me to live is Christ.' Under the guidance of this we are called, not to a materialistic life spent in pleasure, or in the creating of wealth and reputation for ourselves, nor even to a merely social life dependent for its interest on our immediate circle of friends and associates, but rather to a life on the highest possible levels, controlled by the will of God and inspired by the fellowship of Christ who has shown us the way to the Father. Thus abiding in the Eternal we cannot be unprepared for the changes of time. The horizons of our lives stretch away beyond the limits of our mortal lives and we see the end from the beginning.

From our text, also, we may draw comfort in our moods of personal depression and in the lonely hours of bereavement. The life which is lived in Christ holds no fear for us or for those whom we love, even when the shadows lie deepest on our mortal lives. For the Christ in whom we live hath brought life and immortality to light, and for us death can be no abrupt change, no catastrophe. The portal opens for us upon an endless future, and through the gates of death we shall pass with gladness—onwards and upwards—to that heavenly life which is at present veiled from our mortal eyes, but is hid with Christ in God. If to us to live is Christ, to die will indeed be gain. But the gain can come to us only if we realize that our present duty, our all-absorbing duty is to *live*—live in Christ.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Pentateuchal Criticism.[1]

The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch finds a doughty defender in Professor Naville, whose book is an uncompromising attack on the methods and results of the Higher Critics. Their theory of the compositeness of the Pentateuch he replaces by a vastly more fantastic theory of his own, viz. that Moses wrote it in Babylonian cuneiform, that centuries afterwards Ezra translated this into Aramaic, and that later still—hardly earlier than 200 B.C.—this Aramaic was translated into Hebrew.

Three points in the critical theory of the Pentateuch seem especially to provoke Professor Naville: (1) That it regards this section of the Old Testament as composite; (2) that it regards its constituent parts as anonymous; and (3) that it declines to take statements like 'these are the words which Moses spake' at their face-value. But (1) has Professor Naville never heard of the Diatessaron? Here is proof positive—and there is other proof in abundance—that compositeness was a favourite device of Semitic historians. Again, (2) as to anonymity, does any one know who wrote the book of Malachi, or Isaiah 40–55, or Job? And again, (3) it is well known that in ancient historians the ascription of speeches to particular speakers implies no more than that they are dramatically appropriate. The truth is that Professor Naville comes forward frankly as a 'defender of tradition in all the domains of literature,' and his complimentary reference to the totally unconvincing volumes of Dr. M. G. Kyle is ominous. When he says, as he does more than once, that the Higher Criticism is merely a work of destruction, either he does not really know it from the inside, or he is guilty of a deliberate caricature. More than thirty years ago Joseph Wood wrote: 'The higher critics are not wolves waiting to devour. They are the real friends of the Bible, withdrawing our eyes from details which we once fancied important, and fixing them upon the eternal truths and the grander elements which have been more or less obscured.' This is even truer now than it was when it was written.

Doubtless the Babylonian language and script were well known in Western Asia about the time of Moses, but this is very far indeed from proving that he wrote the Pentateuch in that language and script or even that he wrote it at all. The overwhelming arguments—drawn from many different lines of evidence—against the Mosaic authorship, Professor Naville makes only one serious attempt to meet—in his attempt to prove that the legislation is prospective: but till those arguments are met, we must take the liberty of continuing to believe that the results reached by the skilful, patient, and devoted toil—extending over 170 years—of the scholars of many lands, are not likely to be far from the truth.

Professor Mackay writes a useful introduction, and his translation is eminently smooth and readable.

John E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

[1] *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch*, by Professor Édouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., translated, with an introduction, by Reverend Professor John R. Mackay, M.A.; foreword by Sir William M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. (T. & T. Clark; pp. xxxv+156. 5s.)

Hieroglyphics.[2]

The French are justly proud of their great countryman, Jean François Champollion, the founder of modern Egyptology, whose portrait adorns the frontispiece of the book under discussion; and two French Orientalists have taken advantage of the centenary of Champollion's great discovery, which is being celebrated this year, to publish an introduction to the study of hieroglyphics in a volume which is to be the first of a series of manuals on Oriental languages and literatures. The volume appears opportunely, as interest in ancient Egypt, if not exactly at fever-heat, is keener and more widely diffused than it has been for many a long day, and it is much to be hoped that this vague interest will in some quarters issue in real study.

Any one who has ever attempted to master the language and the writing of ancient Egypt will be

[2] *Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes*, par H. Sotta, directeur d'études à l'école pratique des hautes études, et E. Driston, professeur à l'institut catholique de Paris. (Librairie Orientaliste, Paul Geuthner, Paris. 20 francs.)

likely to agree with Diodorus when he says that long application is necessary before one can succeed in reading it perfectly. But the volume before us makes the study of hieroglyphics as attractive and simple as so essentially intricate a study can be made. The first part deals with the principles and the evolution of the system and with its extension into the cursive hieratic and the still more cursive demotic, incidentally discussing the difficulties of the vocalization. The second part sketches the story of the attempt to decipher the hieroglyphics, beginning with the allusions to them in classical antiquity, whose writers do not seem to have clearly grasped their phonetic as distinct from their ideographic value, continuing it through the patristic allusions on to the tentative and not very fruitful work of Kircher in the middle of the seventeenth century, and reaching its brilliant consummation in the decipherment of the Rosetta Stone, which was discovered in 1799 (inadvertently given on p. 102 as 1899). Appended are twenty-three tabulated lists of hieroglyphics, together with carefully explained specimens of all three kinds of texts. The interest and value of the discussion are heightened by a good reproduction of the Rosetta Stone, with its hieroglyphic, demotic, and Greek.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

In the Study.

An Invocation.

As rest is sweet to the weary, and the cooling stream to him that is athirst, so are Thy Sabbaths to us, O Lord, and the fountain that springs up in Thy house. Like as the hart desireth the water brooks, so let our souls thirst for Thee, the Living God, that in Thy presence we may find both strength and peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Can you stop yourself?[1]

'Say ye of the righteous, that *it shall be* well *with him*: for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! *it shall be* ill *with him*: for the reward of his hands shall be given him.'—Is $3^{10.\ 11}$ (RV).

WHY is it, do you think, that ferns like to grow in the shade? that they shrink back into the woods, or gather in great clumps in the cool hollows? Oh! just because they always do it. Yes, but why? Other flowers, as a rule, make for the open as fast as they can, pant for light and air and warmth, love to bask in the sunshine. Look at the crocus, how it holds up its cup to have it filled with sunshine. But ferns slip away into dim and shady places, among the trees, or under the steep banks, anywhere almost where there is not much sunshine. Why? I don't think that you would ever guess. For wise men tell us that the reason is this, that ferns are among the oldest things in the world—ferns and toadstools, and some others. There are people who are very proud because they belong to an old family, because for hundreds of years their fathers, and their fathers' fathers have lived in the old house there, far up the avenue in the great park, and for hundreds of years have sat in the great square pew down in the little village church; because there are dozens of monuments, and the figure of an old crusader with his feet crossed, and stained glass windows, all with their name upon them—this one to their ancestor Sir John who fought at Crécy, and that one to Sir Thomas who fell at Flodden, and all the rest of them. But the ferns are a far, far older family than any one's; they have been living, not for a few centuries only, but for hundreds of thousands of years, for millions of them it may be, for all I know, have been living indeed so long that the earth is quite changed since they began. Then there was very little light in it, no glorious, sunny, summer days, no real days, as we would say, at all, but only a creepy kind of twilight. For there was everywhere a kind of thick, hot, steamy mist, and the sun never properly pierced through. And ferns lived then in a dim shade, because there was nothing else but shade. And they have never lost the habit. The old mists have all gone long, long ago, the sunshine streams down upon everything, but the ferns don't like these new-fashioned notions;

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

they shrink back into the woods where the shade they know still lingers. They cling to their old ways, they have never got over them, never got out of them, all these millions of years. So, you see, how very careful you and I must be, what we do and what we don't do. Because when once you get into a habit, it is desperately difficult ever to get out of it again. Look at the ferns, the silly things! And it is so easy to make a habit. You remember where that path runs through the meadow or over the moor. How was it made, just there? Well, one day some one strolled across, and some one else who came behind, seeing that the grass was pressed down a little, took the same road, and the next, and the next, and the next, just followed those who had gone before them, till now a track has been worn bare and broad, and everybody goes that way, although, perhaps, it is not the straightest, but goes winding and twisting quite a lot. So, once we do anything, we are all apt to keep on doing it. Watch that cart on the road; you see it too has jolted into that deep rut that all the former carts have made. Be grumpy to-day, and you'll be apt to be grumpy next night you are out playing. Lie in bed too long this morning, and you'll soon grow into a habit of it. And a habit once made is very difficult to break. It's like running down a hill. Unless you stop yourself right off, and once you have started it is not easy, you just have to go on faster and faster, and though you begin laughing, it soon gets horridly bumpy; but on you have to go, quicker and quicker, even when you don't like it, not one bit. And so cross people get crosser and crosser, and nice people get nicer and nicer. And we must be very careful what we choose, and how we begin.

Long ago in Greece there was a horrid little chap who was dreadfully cruel to some birds, and they didn't only give him the birch rod, but they put him to death. For, said they, if he has begun like this, what will he do when he has run a little farther down the hill? To-day he is cruel to poor birds, to-morrow he'll be cruel to men and women. Better put him out of the way! That seems hard, and yet look at the ferns, and see how difficult it is to break a habit, when it is formed, or to stop being what we have once become.

You girls sometimes look at mother when she is tired and headachy. Wait, you tell yourself, till I'm grown up, and what a splendid time I'm going to give her; no tire then, but I'll get her everything she wants. And it is nice of you to think of that. But I'm not sure that anything will ever really come of it! For you're so selfish now in heaps of little things that I'm afraid that you'll be selfish when you are grown up too! If you would clear the table for her now, and offer to run messages now, and see things for yourself that you might do, without always waiting to be asked, and sometimes sulking over it, then I would have more hope. But the ferns began to live in the shade, and they still live there, even yet. And if you start off being selfish, take you care that you don't end by getting worse and worse, that you aren't always selfish. Or you fellows lie in bed dreaming of the splendidly brave things you are going to do; how you will win the V.C., or save some one from drowning, something fine and noble. Well, I hope you will. But it does not look very likely just at present. For the other day when you got into a hole at school, what then? Didn't you rather funk and say what wasn't altogether straight, instead of owning up to things and taking your punishment like a man? But, if you want to be brave, you must start being brave. For a good habit is like a bad one, you must begin; and, once you start it, it grows easier and easier, until at last you couldn't possibly do anything else, couldn't be anything but brave, and are brave every time, and without thinking. And so let us be very, very careful how we begin. For look at the ferns still growing in the shade, and missing all the glory of the sunshine! And some silly people do make such a mess of things!

About a Mould.[1]

'Then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf.'—Ex 32^{24}.

There is nobody so wise that he has not said something foolish at some time; and we say the most foolish things when we have done wrong, and don't admit it, and are trying to find excuses. Then we persuade ourselves that amazingly silly things are quite sensible.

Here was Aaron, who had made a golden calf for the children of Israel to worship, taken to task by Moses for what he had done, and this is what he says: 'It's not really my fault. You can't blame me. I put gold into the fire and a most extraordinary thing happened. It turned out a calf!'

Did any grown man ever talk such nonsense?

[1] By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

Aaron knew very well that you could go on putting gold into a fire for ever and it would never turn out a calf, unless—and this is what he didn't mention—you first made a mould. He had made a mould which made it certain it would turn out a calf. He didn't need to wonder what it would turn out. He knew, and had no right to be astonished or to say he wasn't to blame.

Imagine anybody at the dinner-table saying, 'Isn't this wonderful? Cook put jelly and water and fruit and things into a pot and it turned out this beautiful shape!' Every one would laugh and say, 'Of course it did, because she put it all into a mould and it just had to turn out that shape.'

It's not an accident that the king's head is on a penny. It's there because it was stamped there, and if you go to the Royal Mint you can see the dies that stamp it on the penny.

Now about these words 'stamp,' 'mould,' 'shape.' We talk of people 'cast in honour's mould,' 'a fine stamp of a man.' The Bible says Jesus was 'stamped with the character of God.' We say of a boy, 'How is he going to turn out?' 'How is he shaping?' And the answer is, 'He'll turn out the shape of the mould that is made for him.' It's just like the pudding; all the things that go to make a man—will and impulses and affections—are poured into a mould when he is young and they can take any shape. The mould makes certain the sort of man that he will 'turn out.' There is no guesswork about it. It is certain.

Father and mother are trying to make the mould for you, so that you will turn out fine men and women.

You don't always like it. It restrains you. You want to do just what you like. Some boys and girls go their own way and their character is shapeless, like a shape that has not set and collapses when it is turned out. Some pour their thoughts and desires into evil moulds and turn out evil men and women. God has shown us the mould into which He wishes to shape our natures; it is Jesus Christ. We are meant to bear His likeness, to have His character stamped on us; and all that God does to us in our life is meant to make us turn out to be like Him. No man, good or bad, just happened by accident to turn out what he is. Life brings us trials and hot temptations and fierce strains. They are like the fire, but they themselves don't make us good or bad. There must be the mould for the gold to run into and take shape.

It is not easy for fathers and mothers to mould us right. It is very difficult for us ourselves. Only Jesus Himself can really do it. Will you let Him? Give yourself to Him in the beginning and no one will wonder how you are going to 'turn out.'

Bring your golden beginnings, your wavering wills, and wandering affections, your flitting thoughts and restless minds, that are ready to take any shape now. Bring them to Him and let Him mould and shape your character into a noble Christian shape, bearing His own image.

Aaron made the calf mould and wasted the people's gold. Our Lord makes no mistakes. Come to Him in the beginning then with this prayer,

O may Thy Spirit seal our souls,
and mould them to Thy will,
That our weak hearts no more may stray,
but keep Thy precepts still.

The Christian Year.

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Strength and Joy.

'The joy of the Lord is your strength.'—Neh 8^{10}.

It was in the days of the return from Babylon that the two leaders, Nehemiah the soldier and Ezra the scholar, came upon the page of history. Nehemiah had his rougher part to play first. Now, that work done, the patriot yielded to the student, and the law was read to the people. But the faces of the multitude grew graver. An occasional sob was heard as law solemnly followed law, and they began to realize the conditions on which they might dwell within the new-built walls. Finally, there broke forth the great cry of a nation in tears. The crowd was ignorant, and in the reaction after their exciting labours they were ready for any discouragement. But the leaders knew how much remained to be done, and that strength was needed now more than ever. Life demands of us all that we be strong, and our hearts respond in a great longing. To be able to fight and to labour and to wait, to be competent for our tasks—what heart does not answer to the delight in strength?

But there are many sorts of strength, and some of them are of little worth.

1. There is *natural robustness*, mere weight of muscle, unimpaired health, and unbroken success. This had been the kind of strength which the

Israelites had exercised in their building. The sheer force of the work had carried them on in the excitement of the hour, and it had been enough for that labour. But now they collapsed when they realized life's finer tasks and more exacting demands. Such blind strength is coarse-grained, often feelingless and inconsiderate, never delicate enough for more than the rougher tasks.

II. Again, there is the *passionate strength of sorrow*. Every one knows the amazing feats which desperate men may perform; and, when the first outburst of such emotion has passed, it is still possible to be strong in a dogged, hopeless fashion, resolute without enthusiasm. Such strength might easily have been sought for by these Israelites, now that their old strength was broken. These laws were impossible, and there was no use trying to please their God.

III. There is the *glad strength of God*. It was to men standing among such alternatives that the words were spoken. The Lawgiver was also the Rejoicer, and He would have men to rejoice in His joy and so be strong. There could be no escape from the laws which had discouraged them. Through the law the people must pass on to the heart of God, and there find joy. The people were learning God's laws with consternation; the leaders knew His character and heart. And they knew that He who had given the sombre law was joyous for evermore. At the heart of things, in the depths of the universe, there was unfailing gladness. If they are to bear the laws of their God and still be glad, it must be because underneath the stern mask of commandment there is a smile on the Lawgiver's face. They are to rejoice with their God while they obey His laws.

> Heart, heart, how slow thou art
> With thy morning hymn of praise!
> Does the love no joy impart
> Which has lit up all thy days?
> Why so sad, amid the glad
> Sunshine, which is God's and thine?
> Oh, the bliss that may be had,
> Lost in thoughts of love divine![1]

Certain characteristics mark this glad strength which is to be found for men in God.

1. Such strength is *intelligent* and not blind. If we have seen the Creator rejoicing in His works, there is something to be glad about. Behind the joy lies not merely muscle or emotion, but reason and right thought. As the walls of Troy were supposed to have risen to the music of their builders' singing, as all works of art have been defined as the expression of their maker's joy, so men who take their tasks from God, sharing His joy of creation, rejoice in them and do them well.

2. Such strength is also *unselfish*. God is blessed because He is for ever blessing. It is this generous joy, rejoicing in doing good to others, which alone gives real strength to character. In a world like this, where there is so much misery, it must sometimes occur to every happy spirit to ask whether any man has a right to enjoy himself. He has such a right only on condition that his is the generous joy of the Lord. 'We may dare to be very happy while doing our utmost to help a brother.'

3. Further, this is *peaceful* strength. With God there is no spasmodic effort. The heavens are calm above earth's strained and anxious life. In God, by faith we do enter into His rest, and are 'strong in grave peace.' God's peace within a soul makes room for joy, and to be glad thus quietly is to be strong.

4. Lastly, this strength is *victorious*; it is strength which has been reached through weakness. God, as we have seen Him in Jesus Christ, has conquered sorrow and death, and revealed a joy achieved through pain, and a strength made perfect in weakness. It is such strength that is found in the joy of the Lord, for all our joy also has in its heart some conquered sorrow.

This glad strength is available and it is our duty to possess it. We have no right to weakness and gloom. Our God rejoices, Christ is risen, and the hosts of heaven are singing a new song. There is gladness at the heart of things. It is for us to believe it and to win the victory of faith. For those who do believe it, and rejoice in God, out of weakness are indeed made strong.[2]

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Harvest.

'Give us this day our daily bread.'—Mt 6^{11}.

'Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.'—Jn 4^{35}.

The harvest season was much more protracted in Palestine than it is with us. It involved more

[1] Walter C. Smith.

[2] J. Kelman, *Ephemera Eternitatis*, 113.

toil, and it necessitated the employment of more hands; for not only was there no reaping machine in use, but even the scythe was unknown. The grain was levelled, slowly and laboriously, with the sickle—an implement similar to our shearing-hook, but somewhat larger in sweep, and with the point turned backward instead of forward. When at last all the levelled swarths were securely bound and dried and placed in the stackyard, the Jew of our Lord's day and his family and servants feasted and rejoiced. Gladness and merriment were the prevailing notes. Then along with his brother farmers and their male servants from all over the land he and his servants made their way to the capital to attend the House of God and to keep the Feast of Pentecost. In giving thanks for the harvest, then, we are following the example of God's ancient people.

Let us look at some lessons the harvest brings us, and in doing so let us take the two texts together.

1. The petition 'Give us this day our daily bread' seems almost a trifling one. On the one side of it there is the will of God, reaching out into the height of heaven. On the other side of it there are our sins, reaching down into unfathomed depths. And then, between these two infinities, spanning the distance from cherubim to Satan, there is 'Give us this day our daily bread.' Our sin runs back to an uncharted past, but in this petition there is no thought of yesterday. The will of God shall be for evermore, but in this petition there is no to-morrow. Give us this day our daily bread—supply us with a little food to-day—feed us till we go to rest to-night. But when the prayer is set in the light of harvest it is no longer insignificant, for not a crust can be bestowed unless the sun has shone, and the rain fallen, and the earth been quietly busy for millenniums.

There is a lesson here about the *greatness of the things we pray for*. Our tiniest petitions might seem large, if we only knew what the answer would involve. There are things for which we ask that seem little things. They are not plainly vast like some petitions, as when we pray for the conversion of the world. Yet could we follow out that prayer, that little private individual prayer, we might find it calling for the power of heaven as mightily as the conversion of the nations.

2. In the second place, in the light of harvest *think of the toil that lies behind the gift* of daily bread. There are some gifts which we shall always value because of the love which has suggested them. There are others which mean much to us because of the thoughtfulness which they reveal. But now and then a gift is given us which touches us in a peculiar way, because we recognize the toil it cost. A man might despise manna, even though manna was the bread of angels. It came so easily, and was so lightly got, and was so lavishly and freely given. But daily bread is more divine than manna, for it, like manna, is the gift of heaven; and yet we get it not till arms are weary and sweat has broken on the human brow. Think of the ploughman with his steaming horses driving his furrow in the heavy field. Think of the sower going forth to sow. Think of the clanking of the threshing mill, and of the dusty grinding of the corn, and of all those who in our baking-houses are toiling in the night when we are sleeping.

3. In the light of harvest think of the *hands through which the gift of daily bread is given*. Whose hands? Are they the hands of God? 'No man hath seen God at any time.' Are they, then, the hands of the illustrious, or of those whose names are famous in the world? No, it reaches us by the hands of lowly men. It is by these that the Almighty Father shows that He is hearkening to His children. It is His recognition of obscurity, and of lives that are uncheered by human voices, and of days that pass in silence and in shadow into the silence and shadow of the grave.[1]

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Our Opinion of Christ.

'What think ye of the Christ?'—Mt 22[42] (R.V.).

'What think ye of Christ?' Jesus asked the men of His own day. Many people spoke of the Christ: yet the name after all mattered little. Different people could use the same name in different senses. The important thing, the thing that mattered, was the opinion behind the name. Were they looking for a mere descendant of David who should wear the royal purple and break the Roman power? or had they caught any glimpse of a Lordship loftier than David's; a King who should reign as God reigns, by authority over heart and conscience?

1. There is a dignity in being allowed to have opinions. Just because we are men and women it is ordained that each of us shall be in ourselves

[1] G. H. Morrison, *The Afterglow of God*, 274.

a perpetual judge and jury; and life resolves itself into an endless procession of people and things moving before us in order that we may pass judgment upon them, in order that we may form an opinion about them.

And if we have really trained and exercised ourselves to take life seriously and to form a careful and considered judgment in regard to its more important matters, that is a greater dignity still. There is a sense, Lord Morley says in the essay on Compromise, in which taking thought does add a cubit to our stature.

2. We must watch our opinions, and we must watch them on two sides—on the side of their sources, and on the side of their fruits.

(*a*) Our opinions need watching on the side of their sources. How do our opinions come to us? I suppose some of them come to us along the line of family or social tradition; they are the product of the past. Others, again, are more the product of environment. They are borne to us on the wings of the wind; they are afloat in the air we breathe. They come to us, perhaps too often, wrapped up in our morning newspapers. Some of them, let us hope, are dug out of the earth with the spade of our personal inquiry, and knocked into shape by the hammer of our own logic, and tested with the touchstone of our own experience. Others, again, are somewhat affected by our tastes, affections, and desires.

Now it is just on this account that our opinions need watching so much on the side of their sources: our whole selves go to the making of them, and so, if there is any bad strain in us, it may have its effect upon our opinions.

(*b*) But our opinions also want watching on another side—not only on the side of their roots, but also on that of their fruits; not only on the side of their sources, but also on that of their outflow.

There is such a thing as a divorce between thinking and doing. On the whole there is less fault to be found to-day with men's thoughts about Christ than with their practical attitude towards Him. Many men to-day are ready enough to acknowledge Jesus as the perfect Man; many of them are ready to salute Him as Lord, but it is quite another thing to obey Him in their daily life.

What does this mean? It means that, while there can be no right doing without right thinking, it by no means follows that right thinking will issue in right doing. Man has a will. 'I see and approve the better, but I follow the worse.'

'Not every one,' our Lord said on one occasion, 'that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' It is so to-day. There are men whose thinking about Christ seems to be right, but their practical attitude is wrong. They acknowledge Christ as God's Son, and then neglect and ignore Him in life.

But here it is not only the will that is at fault. There is something wrong with the belief also. Where there is a divorce between creed and conduct it proves that there are other ends and interests in which a man believes more passionately than he believes in his creed. His so-called creed may be a nominal creed, but his real opinions are his real guides. Our real opinions about Christ are bound to have some reflexion in our activity. Opinions are powerful, because opinions shape ideals. The two are in such close contact that it is difficult to draw a hard-and-fast line between opinion and ideal and tell where the one stops and the other begins. 'This I think' tends to blend with 'This I do.'

3. The solemnity of having an opinion. As we form our opinion of Christ we ourselves are on trial. Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, the Son of God, presents Himself to our gaze; He asks what we think of Him. Shall we pass Him by with a careless glance as one who matters little to the world and less to us? Or shall we openly and frankly oppose Him, counting His goodness evil, and our evil good? Or shall we call Him Master? It is well to decide upon our knees how we shall answer. We are really judging ourselves.[1]

Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Inaction.

'If thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed: and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?'—Est 4^{14}.

The Book of Esther is a great favourite with the Jews; the Christians, on the other hand, are rather shy of it. For one thing there is no mention of God from beginning to end of the book. And there is the slaughter, which somehow goes against our Christian thoughts of forgiveness and mercy.

[1] J. M. E. Ross, *The Christian Standpoint*, 81.

Luther said of it: 'I am so hostile to this book that I wish it did not exist, for it Judaizes too much and has too much heathen naughtiness.' But whatever we think of the book as a whole there is one great text in it, and for that text alone it is worth retaining among the books of the Bible. It is this text.

1. So we may disobey God, then, by simply standing aside and doing nothing. 'If thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time.' The teaching in this verse is in line with New Testament teaching rather than Old Testament. When the children of Israel arrived at the kingdom of Moab on their journey to Canaan they found a large tract of excellent pasture land suitable for the tribes who were rich in flocks, like the tribes of Gad, Reuben, and Manasseh. These tribes begged Moses to allow them to settle there permanently. But Moses answered with indignation, 'Shall your brethren go to war, and shall ye sit here?' He warned them that if they simply sat still in their own fields, and did not cross the Jordan to fight with the enemy, they would pay the penalty of their indifference to the great cause, if not immediately, then at some future time. 'Thou and thy house shall perish.'

And, to turn to the New Testament. We remember what our Lord said concerning the Judgment Day, when He should come in His glory to judge the earth. He tells us that in that day He will separate men as a shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats: that He will set the one on His right hand and the other on His left, and that to those on His left hand He will say, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels. These shall go away into eternal punishment.' But who are these upon whom such a doom is pronounced? What had they done? They had done *nothing*. And that was their sin, and for that they are punished. 'For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink.' The morality of the Old Testament did not get beyond the Ten Commandments, which are nearly all negative. They tell you what sins we must avoid committing. And it was quite natural that a Jew should ask, 'What actual evil have I ever done?' 'I have never transgressed a commandment of God. I have never been an extortioner or a perjurer.' But Christianity supplies another standard to the conscience. 'Except your righteousness,' says Christ, 'shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven.' What do ye more than others?—that's the question. And Jesus is not satisfied merely to find men guiltless of any deliberate sin. He separates the sheep from the goats on quite another principle. Those on the left are not accused of positive ill-deeds: they may have kept every one of the Ten Commandments from their youth up, but they have neglected the poor, the sick, the prisoner. They have made no attempt to use their influence on the side of Christ and morality. They have simply stood aside, content to look on. Inasmuch as ye did it not!

In the parable of the Talents it is the same truth that is emphasized. The man who received one talent was not guilty of any particular sin except that of inaction, of inactivity. He did not use the one talent he had in God's service. And yet hear the Master's words: 'Take therefore the talent from him, and cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness.' Or look again at the words which Christ addresses to the Church of Laodicea. He does not charge her with committing sins such as those of Ephesus, or Pergamum, or Thyatira, or Sardis, and yet He pronounces a far more bitter curse upon her. 'I know thy works,' He says, 'that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.' It is the curse against uselessness, against the shirker and deserter from the battle of the Lord.

In the *Divina Commedia*, Dante tells us that in hell there is a special place which is prepared for those who have lived without blame and without praise. There he places the people who were neither hot nor cold, neither against God nor for Him, but only for themselves. 'When I saw them,' says the poet, 'I knew that this was the crew of miserable wretches who are hateful to God and also to the enemies of God. Mercy and justice alike disdain them: let us not speak of them, but look and pass them by.' Dante could understand energy and purpose even when exerted in the cause of evil: he had keen sympathy for some whose great sins had rightly condemned them to everlasting punishment. What he could not comprehend was the man who simply stood aside: who withdrew himself from the conflict and shirked all responsibility.

2. What is it that prevents us from coming to

the help of the Lord? The temptation in the case of Esther was to the silence of selfishness. Her people might suffer, but she ran very little risk herself. She was in favour with the king, and if she did anything for the people she would probably lose her position and perhaps even her life.

That is a type of silence that we are often tempted to. It is really astonishing how many Christians can preserve a prudential silence when an evil demands denunciation. 'Who knows,' as Mordecai put it, 'whether God has not called you for just such a time as this?'

It may be that some great cause is in danger. Its advocates and its opponents are pretty evenly balanced. But there is one strong man who, if he would speak, could turn the fortunes of the day; for men believe in his sincerity and disinterestedness, and the humbler supporters of the cause are waiting in hope to hear what he will say. But he sits in silence or makes an unworthy speech of compromise. He lets the golden opportunity pass, and it may be that a great injustice is done or the cause of truth is retarded for years for want of the word he could so easily have spoken.

Blot out his name then, record one lost soul more,
One task more declined, one more footpath untrod,
One more triumph for devils and sorrow for angels,
One wrong more to man, one more insult to God.

But the call may come to us equally in the office, in the workshop, in the field or at home, and if we do nothing we are an influence dead against the influence of Christ. 'He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.'

3. But God's work is not arrested by our failure to do it. He gets it done in some other way. 'Then shall relief and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place.' There is a wonderful encouragement in that. God leaves none of His work unfinished. *It* can do without us, but *we* cannot do without it. 'Thou and thy father's house shall perish,' said Mordecai, and that great principle is true not only as regards the life to come, but true in this life also. Mordecai did not say whether the destruction would come immediately. People do not become reprobates all at once. The process of individual and national decay is usually, if not always, gradual. And at the last the judgment consists in the deterioration of character that comes to a man when he consistently ignores his duty. It consists also in the unhappy retrospect of a life that might have been worth something, but which is of no consequence to man or God—just a handful of withered grass. It consists in the self-contempt and wretchedness which come to a man in that hour when he is forced to face his own soul and to see himself as he is.

The Face Value of the Gospels.

By the Reverend Edward Beal, Tsolo, South Africa.

To 'depreciate the Jesus of History out of reverence for the living Christ' would be a fallacious procedure in one's search for the spiritual implications of Synoptic criticism. Christianity without its historical groundwork degenerates into a merely academical religion or speculative creed. Its insistence upon the tangible incarnation of Divine manhood upon earth is its most vital characteristic. Its vivid picture of the historical Jesus—that flawless man of God who has left His footprint upon the common dust of our highways, who talked to the vendor in the market-place, whose quick eyes smiled in pity upon outcast men and women, whose generous social warmth could call the imbecile out of his gruesome retreat and the children to His knee, whose soul was deeply involved in human friendships—this picture is indelibly engraved upon the hearts of millions of simple Christians. In Galilee the Divine metaphysic was once for all disclosed to fisherfolk and tax-collectors. 'We know nothing of any Eternal Christ except as the spirit of Jesus working out its influence in the hearts of men.'

Yet it would be an act irreconcilable with the

spirit of Jesus Himself to overlook the case of the unemotional and incredulous mind. There are many who are genuinely attracted by the Jesus of the Gospels who find it impossible to give their consent to current theories of inspiration. By no means the least significant feature about Christianity is its distinctive appeal to different sorts of people. Apart from all theories of inspiration, all postulations about the historicity of the narratives, the Gospels themselves possess what may be termed a face value which is simply astonishing. This value would remain unshaken could it be proved beyond controversy (as certain critics would have us believe) that the Parables of Dives and Lazarus, the Prodigal Son, the Young Ruler, like the story of the betrayal by Judas, are more or less elaborate sketches typifying the rejection of the Jesus-cult by the Jewish people, or could it be demonstrated clearly (as Cheyne latterly suggested) that the twelve Apostles, the seventy Disciples and other professedly real facts in the Synoptic records possessed no actual reality. Were these records, indeed, suddenly revealed to us as deliberate and unpardonable forgeries, much of their surface value would stand. For it is obvious that, in order to create such a literature as this, the writers must have been impelled by a religious crisis of pre-eminent importance in the history of religious thought.

The Synoptic Gospels hold a unique place in modern life simply as documents. They offer a practical norm of personal character that has never been fully attained. Musty with age and misuse as these papyri may be, they have never been absorbed into that vast realm of dead literature. Is there any other 'book of life' that has so completely defied all effort after emulation, or that has given occasion to such heart-searching discussions as to the literalness or figurativeness of its moral injunctions? The baffling philosophy of the child-spirit, of unanxious concentration upon the development of character, of the scorning of mammonism and selfishness, is far beyond the reach of our contemporary effort. We take a further step into the teaching of the Gospels, and we discover an internationalism which defies our foremost diplomacy. The mighty spiritual ideal of the Kingdom of the Cross seems as if it must go far before its day shall dawn. It is probable that all our present-day uneasiness about the state of international ethics has its roots in these documents. Yet there is no nation but, if brought to the bar of confession, would be compelled to admit that the ideals of Jesus, even as touching the Sermon of the Mount alone, are 'too high, too pure, too deep' to be achieved through the medium of modern politics.

The Gospels contain a conception of man's nature which the most illuminating discoveries of science have not rendered effete. Psychology has verified many theories which were set forth here in a practical and homely style twenty centuries ago. The claim is not that Jesus possessed any scientific knowledge, but that the teachings are so broadly-based and so worldly-wise and spring from such a fine familiarity with the human mind and its workings, that it is conceivable that science will never supersede them. Consider the subject of healing. Recent years have taught us many things about its methods. One of these is that healing by the suggestion of personality is not the fairy-tale we had imagined it. It is not difficult to believe that this might be a very great power indeed in the case of one possessed of unique personality and force of character. Some of us are actually finding ourselves turning with credulity to the healing episodes of the early Church. Harnack's summary of the attitude of Jesus toward disease has a typically modern savour. 'He nowhere says that sickness is a beneficent infliction, and that evil has a healthy use. It never occurs to him to sympathize with the pain.' His aim is to abolish it; to flick away the sickness as one would any loathsome insect. 'The language of the prodigal son,' says Professor G. A. Coe, '"he came to himself," is scientifically accurate.' Nor must we overlook the corroboration which mysticism and prayer—both vital Gospel principles—receive at the hands of present-day psychologists.

Similarly, modern biology rather enhances than disparages the Synoptic doctrine of sin, as well as the whole concept of the Incarnation. Our modern intuition, that sin is some form of disease, finds ample support in those stories where Jesus so mysteriously links up the cure of sickness and the forgiveness of sins. The Incarnation was a deliberate step taken by God in order to secure the ultimate end of creation: the maturity of the Divine life in man. The sacrifice of Jesus upon the Cross is the spiritual reversal of the law of the survival of the fittest: the sacrifice of the fit for

the sake of the unfit, and the 'turning of the world upside down' in the process.

The Synoptic Gospels possess an unmatched catholicity of appeal. There are no other sacred books extant, purporting to represent a revelation of the Divine will, about which men may hold totally different opinions though still faithful to that revelation. A child of six, with his awed affection for the Big Brother who always has time for children; the disillusioned man of the world who turns to Jesus because he seeks a comforter who knows the human mind as none other ever knew it; the heavy-booted farmer's lad surreptitiously conning the Testament his mother has packed in his kit; the trained critical expert 'grinding at grammar'; the Unitarian and the Salvationist; the Christian and the honest Agnostic: with one accord these testify to the undying appeal of the Gospel story. There is truly a sense in which such records as these stand entirely above criticism. There is nothing worth cherishing that could possibly be lost by the mishandling of critics. After having almost passed through what will hereafter be known as the most trying period of Biblical investigation, the real place of the New Testament in our modern life is more secure than ever. Nothing could ever supplant its message to mankind apart from some new and direct revelation from God Himself.

It is practically impossible for any man honestly to avoid the appeal of the Gospels. Whatever he may or may not believe about them, their unique place in our social system cannot be lost sight of. Their historic contribution to the spiritual emancipation of mankind, their supreme wisdom and comfort for the soul of every generation, their unfailing timeliness, their directness of censure, their generosity of judgment, and perhaps above all else their unsullied dignity and simple delicacy, will ensure for them an unparalleled place among the annals of man's struggle toward righteousness.

Contributions and Comments.

Babylonian Wisdom.

Professor Langdon's book, which he has entitled *Babylonian Wisdom*, appeals to a much wider circle than its title would imply. It is a book which is interesting and also enlightening to a far larger public than that which concerns itself with oriental lore. It is not only the orientalist or the theologian who will find an interest in it; the problems with which it deals are the problems which confront the modern world even more directly than they confronted the world of the past.

By 'Babylonian Wisdom' Professor Langdon means the attempts made by the thinkers of ancient Babylonia to solve or answer the chief enigma of religion. Why is it that in this world of ours the wicked flourish and the righteous suffer? Why is it that what is punished is ignorance and stupidity rather than wickedness? The moral instincts of man and the laws of nature seem to be hopelessly at variance one with the other.

Like the Jews, the Babylonians found the explanation even more difficult than we do. Their religion held out to them no prospect of future punishment and reward in a world where the inequalities of this life would be redressed. It was in this world only that punishment or reward awaited them; the next world was a land of darkness and misery, where the spirits of the dead flitted like bats in the shadow, with dust alone for their food.

Some of the more instructed took refuge in agnosticism or scepticism. One of the texts translated in this volume by Professor Langdon is a remarkable conversation between a master and his slave, who, like the Greek Æsop, personifies the philosophy of experience and encourages his master in his pessimism. Fame and favour at Court, rich foods, a reputation for mercy and forgiveness, the love of women, orthodoxy in religion and sacrifice to the gods, charity and righteous conduct—all alike, we are told, are vanity; the malefactor and benefactor share the same fate, and the inevitable conclusion follows that death is better than life.

Orthodox writers endeavoured to combat these arguments of scepticism, and one of the results was a work very similar to the Book of Job, the translation of which occupies a considerable part of Professor Langdon's book. The hero was a certain Tabi-utul-Enlil who had lived at Nippur many centuries before it was written. Like Job, Tabi-utul-Enlil was wealthy and pious, and, like Job, misfortune after misfortune fell upon him. A large part of the work is occupied with his complaints of the injustice of the gods, and this is followed by the author's reply. On the one hand, man, it is argued, is no judge of the divine ordering of the world; his knowledge is limited, and he cannot by searching find out God. On the other hand, suffering is the punishment of sin, and the sufferer may be expiating, as it were vicariously, sins that were committed by his ancestors. But in the end justice is done, and the work closes with an account of the restoration of Tabi-utul-Enlil to his former prosperity. Here, again, we have a parallel in the Book of Job, and at the same time a proof that the epilogue and prologue of the latter book are no late additions to it, as criticism would have us believe, but must have formed part of the original scheme of the narrative. We find them already in the older Babylonian story.

Professor Langdon has included in his volume fragments of a Babylonian book (or books) of Proverbs. Here, again, the analogy to the Hebrew Book of Proverbs is striking, and here again we find a vein of scepticism. 'An amuletic ring does not give protection' is one of the sayings; 'He is a thoroughly good man, yet is clothed in rags,' is another. Perhaps, however, the most pessimistic utterance to be found in the 'Wisdom' of the Babylonians is, as indeed we should expect, in the Dialogue between the Master and his Slave: 'Make thy way to the mounds of ruined cities, visit the relics of old; behold there the skulls of the men that have been before us: who of them is a doer of evil, who a servant of righteousness?'

These old Babylonian fragments suffer much from the fact that they are fragments. Sometimes they break off at the most interesting point; sometimes their mutilated condition makes the translation of them uncertain. Since, however, excavation has been resumed on the ancient sites of the country, much has been done in the way of completing the texts, and as new libraries of tablets are brought to light we may hope that sooner or later all gaps will be filled up, and the works of the Babylonian philosophers will be placed, complete and perfect, in our hands.

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

Philippians ii. 12.

The interpretation unearthed (in June number, p. 429) by Dr. Thomson from *The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* (1855) can be traced back to a considerably earlier date. (1) Thomas Belsham (*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle translated, with an Exposition and Notes*, 2 vols., 1822) renders μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου 'with respect and reverence,' and adds, 'probably a colloquial phrase, by which is expressed respectful deference to the directions of a teacher or master. . . . In this sense it is properly connected with the clause which precedes it, and expresses the deference which the Philippians paid to the instructions of the apostle.' (2) Edward Harwood (*A Liberal Translation of the New Testament*, 2 vols., 1768) renders the phrase 'with the most submissive deference and solicitude,' remarking that it is to be put in connexion with ὑπηκούσατε and not with κατεργάζεσθε. (3) Both Belsham and Harwood refer with approval to the notes of an earlier writer, one Pierce or Pearce. Doubtless he is the 'J. Pierce, of Exon.' whose version—'as you have always obeyed me with humility and concern'—appears in William Bowyer's *Critical Conjectures and Observations on the New Testament.* For the concluding clause of the verse all three concur in some such rendering as 'promote earnestly the welfare of each other.' Their observations on this clause and its connexion with the next verse deserve more attention than they seem to have received from later commentators.

J. H. Burn.

Whatfield Rectory, Ipswich.

The Pavement.

Fresh significance attaches to the scene of Christ's judgment before Pilate, when it is realized what this λιθόστρωτος or 'Pavement' was. We know that wherever a Roman official of high civil or military rank went, he carried about with him his Judgment-seat or Bench or Tribunal, and that this Judgment-seat was set up on a floor or pave-

ment, composed of little coloured cubes or tesselæ. The Roman general on foreign service carried in panniers, on mule-back, these fitted blocks of wood or marble, as outward and visible sign of his status, and in order that there might be about the tribunal and all its proceedings a certain dignity and impressiveness. At each camping-place they were laid down, to be taken up again when the regiment or army moved forward. It was to such a 'Pavement' that Jesus was brought as 'Prisoner at the Bar.' But there is something beneath this.

Professor Arthur Quiller-Couch (*On the Art of Writing*, pp. 166–68 and 193–95) says: 'Wherever the Roman's feet went, there went the tessellated pavement for them to stand on. . . . Will you suggest that he did this because they were pretty? You know that practical men—conquering generals—do not behave in that way. He did it because they were sacred; because, like most practical men, he was religious, and his gods must go with him. . . . Upon these "Pavements" the gods of legend—of love, youth, and plenty—Bacchus, Orpheus, Apollo, Venus, Jove and Ganymede, Leda and the Swan—these, and other pagan emblems are found constantly repeated.'

The dramatic intensity of the scene when Pilate 'brought Jesus out and seated Him *on* the tribunal' (so Moffatt renders Jn 19[13]) 'at a spot called the "mosaic pavement,"' is sensibly heightened when it is realized that before the Prisoner were spread representations of episodes in the life and loves of the gods of pagan story. It was indeed a striking situation: the Christ confronted by Jupiter, 'Deus Optimus Maximus' by the Carpenter. To realize it is to gain new light upon the Governor's taunt, 'Behold your King!'

JOHN AULAY STEELE.

Mannofield Parish Church, Aberdeen.

φορτίον and βάρη (Gal. vi. 2, 5).

A ROUGH and serviceable translation of φορτίον may be found in 'knapsack'—a thing *made to be carried*. Βάρη is then easily given its true meaning as the *heavy things* which call for a joint effort. The distinction would appeal to a Roman soldier by translating βάρη as *impedimenta*, the camp equipment which he did not carry on his back.

It is remarkable that Edward Caird discusses this difference in the first of his *Lay Sermons*, without the faintest reference to the Greek.

BERNARD G. HALL.

Knutsford.

A Note on Acts xxvi. 28.

(A.V. 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.')

THE reading of B and ℵ in this famous passage is as follows: ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι—which is almost untranslatable. It would seem that it was the obvious difficulty in this reading that led the Textus Receptus, with EHLP, to alter ποιῆσαι to γενέσθαι—an alteration from which has sprung the inspired misrendering in the A.V. It must, of course, be rejected, if only because it so palpably *is* a correction; and the intermediate reading of A, with πείθῃ for πείθεις, has therefore been accepted by Alford and other good critics. On this, however, Hort (*Notes on Select Readings*, p. 100) justly remarks that πείθῃ can hardly be equivalent to πέποιθας or πείθεις σεαυτόν, more especially as πείθομαι has just been used in v.[26] in the sense of 'I am convinced'; and he therefore suggests, but doubtfully, πέποιθας for με πείθεις.

Now, remembering the common use of such phrases as τιθέναι παρ' οὐδέν, 'to set at naught,' θέσθαι ἐν αἰσχρῷ, 'to count shameful,' ἐν ἀδικήματος μέρει τίθεσθαι, 'to reckon in the category of crimes,' and the like (in which, though the middle is more usual, the active is common), I would propose to read here, ἐν ὀλίγῳ με τίθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι—'you regard it as a light matter to make a Christian of *me*': to which Paul replies with a play on ἐν ὀλίγῳ.

I am quite aware that such a reading requires defence. But, first, I believe that it was the position of με that caused the trouble, and inclined the early scribes to find a verb that might govern it directly. Examples of such *hyperbata* are, however, far from uncommon; compare especially Col 2[8], βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν: or 2 Th 2[7], τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας, μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται, where all the best commentators regard ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι as transferred, for the sake of emphasis, from its natural place *after* ἕως to a position before it. Thus we see that Agrippa is really saying, '*Me* a Christian! You won't do that in a hurry!'

It remains to justify the use of the form τίθεις

as a second person present indicative. I find on opening Helbing's *Grammatik der Septuaginta*, p. 105, that in the LXX τίθημι usually keeps its Attic inflections; but in the ℵ* reading of Pr 15^{22} we have ὑπερτίθονται, which clearly points to a form τίθω: and in 1 Es 4^{30} (without *varia lectio*) occurs ἐπιτιθοῦσαν=ἐπετίθεσαν, which points equally clearly to ἐπιτιθέω. One of these forms would permit us to use τίθεις, the other the merely accentually different τιθεῖς.

In Ac 3^{2} (Blass, p. 48) we light on ἐτίθουν. In the N.T. τίθημι is comparatively rare; but the analogous ἵημι is common; and a reference to Blass (p. 50) will reveal several instances of ἵημι as a verb in ω: *e.g.* Lk 11^{4}, -ιομεν; Mt 13^{19}, DF read συνίοντος; Ro 3^{11}, συνίων: in fact, according to Blass, there is but a single certain example of the μι inflection of the compound verb συνίημι (compare Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 55). Westcott and Hort (*Notes*, p. 167) inform us that the present τιθῶ occurs twice in Hermas.

As far as I am aware, in the Papyri the μι verbs show less tendency than one would expect to borrow from either the simple or the contracted ω verbs; but Mayser (*Grammatik der Griech. Pap.*, p. 352) says that examples are not rare in which, apart from εἰμί, they show such contamination. In the case of τίθημι, it is true, Mayser gives no instances (the imperative τίθει, of course, hardly counts): but I believe it will be found that in later Greek τίθημι suffered the same fate as the rest. In Modern Greek the only surviving μι verb, as is well known, is εἰμί. I think, then, that though I can give no instance of the precise form τίθεις for the second person present, it may be taken as a more than possible form. Even as early as the date of the supposed prototype of B and ℵ, there is every reason to assume that it might be recognized as not unlikely to have been used by Paul or Luke.

It may be objected, with some plausibility, to this suggestion, that so simple a reading is scarcely likely to have been altered into a harder one. *Lectio ardua potius eligenda.* I have already partially answered this objection: the position of με might well seem a difficulty to the scribe. But further, if τίθεις was an unknown form to the copyist, or if he took it for a present participle, he would almost certainly think it corrupt, and alter it. Precisely so, in 2 Th 3^{6} (in my opinion) even B altered παρελάβοσαν to παρελάβετε, and other scribes 'corrected' it to παρέλαβον or παρέλαβε.

I translate, then, with some confidence, 'You don't seem to think it will take much to make even *me* a Christian!'

E. E. KELLETT.

Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

ALL the well-known features of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be continued in the new volume. The 'Notes of Recent Exposition' will be as prominent as before, and there will be a full treatment of the literature of the month, both home and foreign. In addition to 'In the Study,' we hope to give a series of sermons by well-known preachers of the day, among whom will be Dean Inge, Dr. J. A. Hutton, Dr. J. D. Jones, and Dr. W. M. M'Gregor.

Within the next few months, articles will appear by Dr. Rendel Harris; Professor A. T. Robertson, Louisville, Kentucky; Ven. Archdeacon R. H. Charles; Professor John E. McFadyen; Professor J. M. Shaw, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Professor H. Wheeler Robinson; Professor Édouard Naville; and Professor Dalman.

The Index Volume of the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

In the beginning of next year the Publishers hope to issue the Index Volume. No trouble has been spared to make this Index thoroughly accurate and comprehensive, and it is confidently believed that it will greatly increase the value of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

An Index Volume always formed part of Dr. Hastings' plan, and the need for it has been generally felt, and has been pointed out lately in a number of important reviews. Although two of these appeared a few months ago they only unfortunately came to our notice last week. The review in the *Anglican Theological Review* is by Dr. S. A. B. Mercer, the editor. It deals specially with the twelfth volume of the

E.R.E. In the last paragraph Dr. Mercer points out the necessity of an Index Volume. Here are the first and last paragraphs :

'This is the last volume of Hastings' great work. The first volume of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS was published in 1908. Dr. Hastings had already made his reputation by the publication of his DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE and his DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. But in 1908 his greatest work was begun. There is, without any exception, no work which can at all compare with this great undertaking. The ENCYCLOPÆDIA is limited to Religion and Ethics and yet it consists of twelve large volumes. There is hardly any phase of religion and ethics which is not covered by this great work. It is really a series of technical and elaborate monographs by expert scholars. It is quite beyond the limits of a review to enumerate even the most important of these monographs, for they are legion. The student of religion and ethics has in this great work an almost inexhaustible mine of reliable information.'

'The whole great undertaking, from beginning to end, has been carried through with exceptional accuracy. Dr. Hastings has placed the whole scholarly world decidedly in his debt. No real student of religion and ethics can at all afford to be without this monumental work. I understand that an Index Volume is planned. At any rate, such a volume is now necessary.'

The editor of *The Journal of Religion,* the organ of the Divinity Faculty of the University of Chicago, devotes thirty-one pages to a 'Valuation of Hastings' Encyclopædia,' by a number of competent scholars, and not content with that he gives an article on the treatment of the 'Religions of Japan in the Hastings' ENCYCLOPÆDIA' in the following number (March 1923) which occupies seven pages.

The first 'appraisement' is by Professor Shirley Jackson Case of Chicago. He deals with 'Gentile Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean World.' He sums up his estimate of the value of the *E.R.E.* treatment in his last sentences. 'But certainly there is, as yet, in this particular field, no other modern work that, in thoroughness of treatment and scope of interest, equals or even approximates in value this ENCYCLOPÆDIA. In all probability this value will be considerably enhanced when the Index Volume appears, by which easier access will be given to items of information that may now pass unobserved because of their obscure connexions.' So Professor Jackson Case also looks forward to the issue of the Index Volume.

Professor D. B. Macdonald of Hartford Seminary deals with the treatment of Mohammedanism in the *E.R.E.* We quote his last words : 'This means that the Mohammedan part of this ENCYCLOPÆDIA is a worthy element in the whole. And the whole book, it is certain, is indispensable to any library concerned with the institutes of the thinking of mankind.'

Professor D. B. Macdonald's remark reminds us of an interesting fact. The Publishers tell us that an order for a complete set of the *E.R.E.* has just been received from the 'Biblioteca della Camera dei Deputati' at Rome.

And now we quote our last paragraph—this time from *The Methodist Recorder* of 12th July—although it only concerns the Index Volume indirectly. The paragraph is headed 'Book Prices.' 'Publishers are constantly being told to-day that the price of books is prohibitive for those who need them most, *e.g.* for ministers ; and that that accounts for small libraries in so many manses. The fact may in great measure be true ; but the inference that publishers are grasping and exorbitant in their demands is not sound, in the majority of cases. No firm has done more for meeting the needs of ministers than Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh ; and they have recently made an interesting inquiry into this question in relation to publications of their own. In view of the allegation that the price of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS was prohibitive, Sir John M. Clark, the head of the firm, took a book of fiction, published at 5s., and after counting the number of words it contained, proceeded to estimate the number of words in the last volume of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA. The figures revealed the amazing result that if published at the same rate per hundred words, the cost of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA ought to be fifty-seven pounds per volume, instead of thirty-five shillings ! Twelve such sumptuous volumes, with about a million and a half words in each volume, are bound to cost much money, but it is a work which is a library in itself. It would be a priceless boon to many a man if, when kindly folk are contemplating a presentation to the departing minister, they turned their eyes in some such direction. Few gifts would have a greater or more

varied value than this; and it is a work which most of our brethren would be unable to obtain for themselves.'

SOME TOPICS.

Christians.

'This is true not only of me but of all Christians, that they do not fear, even if they are ill or endure distress or suffer greatly. They quietly leave everything in the hands of God, and even while they suffer, they rejoice and wait patiently until they recover. . . . When I tell you that Christians fear nothing but God, I want you to understand that I am not just pretending, for it is really true. Here are Christ's own unshakable words: "And be not afraid of them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." '

This is the estimate of Tokichi Ishii. To him Christians were people who held the principles of Christ and who lived up to them.

Tokichi Ishii was imprisoned in Tokyo. He was an entirely uneducated man and a very notorious criminal, but in Tokyo Prison he came into contact with Miss West and Miss Caroline Macdonald. They were the only two Christians he had ever known. He became a Christian himself, and whilst waiting the execution of the death sentence, which had been passed upon him, he wrote down his own story. It has now been translated into English and is published by the Student Christian Movement with the title *A Gentleman in Prison* (4s. 6d. net). The Publishers say, and we agree with them, that this story is 'Not unworthy to be set beside some of the other great prison-documents which are among the treasures of the Church of Christ.'

The original Silas Hocking.

Mr. Silas K. Hocking is no longer a young man. He tells this story against himself. 'Towards the end of the War, when he was in Orp-le-Grand a young Canadian came up to him and said:

'"May I ask you a question, sir?"

'"Why certainly," I said, "a dozen if you like."

'"I hope you will not think me impertinent," he went on, "but I should like to ask you if you are the original Silas Hocking?"

'"The original?" I questioned, and I expect he caught a note of surprise or curiosity in my voice for he said hurriedly:

'"Well, you see, it's this way. When I was quite a little chap back home in Canada my mother used to read me the stories of Silas Hocking, and when I saw the notice that he was to lecture to us out here, I thought it couldn't be the real one."

'"But why?" I questioned.

'"Well, you see, I thought that he lived back in the time of John Bunyan or thereabouts, and that he had gone west ages ago." '

Mr. Hocking's life has been a long and a full one, and he has at last been persuaded to write his reminiscences. He calls the volume *My Book of Memory* (Cassell; 10s. 6d. net). It includes chapters on 'Ministers and Laymen,' 'Politicians,' 'Critics, Caricaturists and Humorists,' and 'Mainly about Journalists,' and about them all Mr. Hocking says pleasant things in a delightfully gossipy way.

Precept and Practice.

We can say of the Bible as of no other book, 'that in its heart are the highways to Zion, along which we travel to the sky.

'Now a highway exists not to be talked about, but to be travelled on. We can only know it properly by walking along it, and it serves no real end except as it is put to this practical use. In a Korean village there was a Christian convert who learned the whole of the Sermon on the Mount by heart, and then he set out and tramped a hundred miles that he might recite it to his pastor. When he had finished the recital, he was told that he must now put the Sermon into practice. His reply was, "But that is the way in which I managed to learn it. At first I tried to commit it to memory by rote, and it would not stick. So I hit upon this plan: I would learn a verse, and then go out and find a heathen neighbour and practise that verse on him. Then I found that it would stick!" '

This is a quotation from an article which the Rev. T. H. Darlow, M.A., wrote for the 'Bible in the World,' the monthly organ of the Bible Society. Mr. Darlow has now retired from the position which he held so long and so ably, of Literary Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and we are very glad to note that Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have collected a number of his articles and issued them with the title *At Home in the Bible* (6s. net).

POETRY.

Jimmy Howcroft.

I flew !
Upward climbing to the engine's roar.
The clay is dead, but still the soul can soar ;
Imprisoned here, as by some earthy chain,
In higher life, my soul shall soar again.

This, in brief, is the story of Jimmy Howcroft, whose volume of poems, *The Songs of a Broken Airman* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s. net), has just been published.

But John o' London, in an introduction to the book, has brought us closer to the heart of the tragedy.

A 'half-timer' at the age of twelve, in a Lancashire cotton mill, Howcroft later became an electrician. In 1915, at the age of twenty-two, he joined the Royal Flying Corps, and while acting as observer in France in the following year, his machine crashed, his spine was fractured, and he was condemned to lifelong helplessness, unable to raise hand or foot. To pass away the weary hours in hospital he began to compose the poems contained in this volume, dictating them to his nurse. They were in part published in 1920 and met with considerable success. A second and still more successful edition was published last year. The present volume contains, in more permanent form, all the original poems—some of which have, however, been re-written—together with a number of new poems.

Although Jimmy Howcroft is in constant pain you will find no note of sadness or despair in his poems. They breathe a spirit of cheer and courage that should put all grumblers to shame.

There are in the volume dainty playful verses for children which have something of the Robert Louis Stevenson spirit in them. 'My Shadow,' too, is apparently inspired by Stevenson, but we fancy that beneath the playful whimsicality of the lines there lie regrets 'too deep for tears.'

My Shadow.

I have a little shadow,
  But he's gone out without me,
I don't know where he's gone to,
  I should like to go and see ;
But my night-nurse will not let me,
  So in bed I've got to stay.
And I'm jealous of my shadow,
  'Cause I want to go and play.

There are poems which show a deep and true love of Nature on the part of one who when he could 'go and play' loved the out-of-doors world. But above all there is the fine spirit of Christian hope and courage.

The One Comfort.

When pain and anguish seem too great,
And for relief too long I wait,
I close my eyes that I may see
The Cross of One who died for me ;
And as He hangs suspended there,
Christ sees my grief and bears a share ;
For God is love, He knows and feels,
He, stooping, touches, cleanses, heals.

Louise Imogen Guiney.

Louise Imogen Guiney died in 1920. Her verse and prose, though fairly well-known in the States, are too little known in England. She was a scholar but she never made her scholarship obtrusive, and in all her writing there is a fine sensitiveness. Several short sketches of her life and works have been published, but there was room for a more complete account. This has now been written very sympathetically by E. M. Tenison. The title of the volume is *Louise Imogen Guiney* (Macmillan ; 15s. net). We quote three poems to give an appetite for more.

To One who would not spare Himself.

A censer playing from a heart all fire,
A flushing, racing, singing mountain stream
Thou art ; and dear to us of dull desire
In thy far-going dream.

Full to the grave be thy too fleeting way,
And full thereafter : few that knew thee best
Will grudge it so, for neither thou nor they
Can mate thy soul with rest.

Deo Optimo Maximo.

All else for use, One only for desire ;
Thanksgiving for the good, but thirst for Thee :
Up from the best, whereof no man need tire,
Impel Thou me.

Delight is menace if Thou brood not by,
Power is a quicksand, Fame a gathering jeer.
Oft as the morn (though none on earth deny
These three are dear)

Wash me of them, that I may be renewed,
And wander free amid my freeborn joys:
Oh, close my hand upon Beatitude!
Not on her toys.

DAVY.

Davy, her Knight, her dear, was dead.
Low in the dust was the silken head,
'Isn't there Heaven?'
(She was but seven)
'Isn't there,' sobbing, 'for dogs?' she said.

Trusty and brave and true, who could
Match her hero of hardihood,
Rancourless, selfless,
Prideless, pelfless?
How I should like to be half so good!

Firebrand eye and icicle nose;
Ear enwrought like a guelder rose;
All the sweet wavy beauty of Davy;—
Sad not to answer whither it goes!

'Man is immortal, sage or fool:
Animals end by a different rule.'
So had they prated
Of things created,
An hour before, in her Sunday-school.

'Isn't there Heaven for dogs that's dead?
God made Davy out of His head.
If He unmake him
Doesn't He take him?
Why should He throw him away?' she said.

Fay Inchfawn.

It is for her verse that we know Fay Inchfawn. And so although her latest small volume contains eleven talks—very delightful ones—and very little verse we quote:

I'VE LAID THEM DOWN TO-DAY.

Well, I am done. My nerves were on the rack.
I've laid them down to-day.
It was the last straw broke the camel's back:
I've laid that down to-day.
No, I'll not fume, nor fret, nor fuss, nor fight;
I'll walk by faith a bit, and not by sight.
I think the Universe will work all right.
I've laid it down to-day.

The dread of sorrows I may have to sup,
I'll lay that down to-day.
The circumstance which rubbed me wrong way up,
I'll lay that down to-day.
It will not matter in the age to come,
Whether I sucked the stone or had the plum,
But it will make a difference to some,
If I keep nice, to-day.

So, here and now, the over-weight, the worry,
I'll lay it down to-day.
The all-too-anxious heart; the tearing hurry;
I'll lay these down to-day.
O eager hands! O feet, so prone to run!
I think that He Who made the stars and sun,
Can mind the things you've had to leave undone.
Do lay them down to-day!

The title of the volume is *Homely Talks of a Homely Woman* (Ward, Lock; 2s. 6d. net). The verses are in the last talk—'A Woman's Work is Never Done.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

DEMCO

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY